
The Bancroft Library

University of California • Berkeley

University of California

Bancroft Library/Berkeley
Regional Oral History Office

Friends of The Bancroft Library Diverse Memoirs Series
Earl Warren Oral History Project

Emily H. Huntington

A CAREER IN CONSUMER ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL INSURANCE

With an Introduction by

Charles A. Gulick

An Interview Conducted by
Alice Greene King



Emily Huntington

Carol Baldwin Photograph

All uses of this manuscript are covered by a legal agreement between the Regents of the University of California and Emily H. Huntington, dated 14 January, 1971. The manuscript is thereby made available for research purposes. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publish, are reserved to The Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the Director of The Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley.

Requests for permission to quote for publication should be addressed to the Regional Oral History Office, 486 Library, and should include identification of the specific passages to be quoted, anticipated use of the passages, and identification of the user. The legal agreement with Emily H. Huntington requires that she be notified of the request and allowed thirty days in which to respond.

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Emily H. Huntington

FOREWORD

PREFACE	i
---------	---

INTRODUCTION	iv
--------------	----

INTERVIEW HISTORY	vii
-------------------	-----

EMILY H. HUNTINGTON, LL.D., AWARDED 1964	ix
--	----

I	FAMILY BACKGROUND AND EDUCATION	1
II	STUDENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA	5
III	EARLY WORKING EXPERIENCES	11
IV	A YEAR IN ENGLAND -- THE LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS	22
V	GRADUATE STUDIES AT RADCLIFFE AND HARVARD	32
VI	TEACHING ECONOMICS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA	38
	<u>Research [The Heller Committee]</u>	43
	<u>University Service</u>	47
	<u>Community Service</u>	48
	Costs and Standards of Living	49
	Social Insurance	50
	Old Age Insurance	51
	Unemployment Insurance	52
	Health Insurance	53
VII	THE WAGE STABILIZATION DIVISION OF THE WAR LABOR BOARD	65
VIII	THE REGENTS' OATH	77
IX	AFTER RETIREMENT	89
	<u>Dorothy Williams</u>	91
	<u>Regents' Scholarships</u>	96

<u>Special Opportunity Scholarship Program</u>	98
<u>Community Activities</u>	103
<u>Committee on the Aging</u>	105
INDEX	110

FOREWORD

This interview with Emily H. Huntington, Professor Emeritus of Economics, is the first of the Diverse Memoirs sponsored by the Friends of The Bancroft Library. The Friends established the series of Diverse Memoirs so that the Oral History Office could capture interviews of exceptional importance. These Memoirs document the lives of persons who have made outstanding contributions to the quality of life in California and the West.

Emily Huntington was designated to initiate the series because of her contributions as a teacher at the University and a researcher in the developing field of consumer economics as well as her influence in effecting social insurance at the state and federal levels. Shortly after Miss Huntington's interviews were begun, the Earl Warren Oral History Project, a series jointly funded through the Friends of The Bancroft Library and the National Endowment for the Humanities, was authorized and undertaken. Because Miss Huntington's career dealt with a number of the public issues discussed in the Earl Warren Project, it was appropriate for the two series to join in supporting Miss Huntington's Memoir. In this fortunate circumstance, credit belongs to both for making possible the completion of the following manuscript.

Willa K. Baum, Department Head
Regional Oral History Office

25 August 1971
486 The Bancroft Library
University of California at Berkeley

PREFACE

The Earl Warren Oral History Project, a project of the Regional Oral History Office, was inaugurated to produce tape-recorded interviews with persons instrumental in the political and judicial scene during the Warren Era in California. Focusing on the years 1925 to 1953, the interviews are designed not only to document the life of Chief Justice Warren but to gain new information on the social and political changes of a state in the throes of a depression, then a war, then a postwar boom.

Because of the age of many of the memoirists, efforts in the first phase of the project have been centered on capturing as many accounts on tape as possible. The interviews that were transcribed in this phase, including those in the present volume, have been checked, emended by the memoirist, final typed, indexed, and bound with pictures and other supporting information.

The interviews have stimulated the deposit of Warreniana source material in the form of papers from friends and aides, old movie newsreels, video tapes, and photographs. This rapidly expanding Earl Warren Collection, added to the Bancroft Library's already extensive holdings on 20th Century California politics and history, provides a rich center for research.

The first phase of the Project has been financed by an outright grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, by gifts from local donors interested in preserving data on Warren and his California era, and by additional funds offered by National Endowment for the Humanities on a matching basis. Contributors to the Project include the former law clerks of Chief Justice Earl Warren, the Cortez Society, and many longtime supporters of "The Chief." The Friends of the Bancroft Library were instrumental in the fund raising and supplemented all local contributions from their own treasury.

Amelia R. Fry, Director
Earl Warren Oral History Project

1 July 1970
Regional Oral History Office
486 The Bancroft Library
University of California at Berkeley

EARL WARREN ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

Principal Investigators

Lawrence A. Harper
Ira M. Heyman
Arthur H. Sherry

Advisory Council

Barbara Nachtrieb Armstrong
Walton E. Bean
William R. Dennes
Joseph P. Harris
John D. Hicks
Eugene C. Lee
Adrian A. Kragen
Mary Ellen Leary
James R. Leiby
Dean E. McHenry
Frank C. Newman
Allan Nevins
Sho Sato
Thomas Kuchel
Helen McGregor
Warren Olney, III
John D. Weaver

Earl Warren Oral History Project

Interviews Completed by September 1971

Robert B. Powers, LAW ENFORCEMENT, RACE RELATIONS: 1930-60. 1971

Emily H. Huntington, A CAREER IN CONSUMER ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL INSURANCE. 1971

EARL WARREN'S BAKERSFIELD. 1971

Maryann Ashe and Ruth Smith Henley, Earl Warren's Bakersfield.
Omar Cavins, Coming of Age in Bakersfield.
Francis Vaughan, School Days in Bakersfield.
Ralph Kreiser, A Reporter Recollects the Warren Case.
Manford Martin and Ernest McMillan, On Methias Warren.

LABOR LOOKS AT EARL WARREN. 1970

Germaine Bulcke, A Longshoreman's Observations.
Joseph Chaudet, A Printer's View.
Paul Heide, A Warehouseman's Reminiscences.
U. S. Simonds, A Carpenter's Comments.
Ernest H. Vernon, A Machinist's Recollections.

PERSPECTIVES ON THE ALAMEDA COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE. 1971

John F. Mullins, How Earl Warren Became District Attorney.
Edith Balaban, Reminiscences about Nathan Harry Miller, Deputy District Attorney, Alameda County.
Judge Oliver D. Hamlin, Reminiscences about the Alameda County District Attorney's Office in the 1920's and 30's.
Mary Shaw, Perspectives of a Newspaperwoman.
Willard W. Shea, Recollections of Alameda County's First Public Defender.

EARL WARREN AND HEALTH INSURANCE: 1943-1949. 1971

Russel VanArsdale Lee, MD, Pioneering in Prepaid Group Medicine.
Byrl R. Salsman, Shepherding Health Insurance Bills Through the California Legislature.
Gordon Claycombe, The Making of a Legislative Committee Study.
John W. Cline, MD, California Medical Association Crusade Against Compulsory State Health Insurance.

INTRODUCTION

When Miss Emily Huntington returned to the Berkeley Campus in 1928 as a member of the faculty of economics, I was still working up new courses of my own and helping to finish a book. Because these matters almost literally submerged me, it took me rather longer than it should to realize that this lady was not only a kindred spirit but also a vigorous fighter whom I should greatly prefer to have on my side. Now, more than forty years later, it is a solid satisfaction to recall that with a few significant exceptions we found ourselves on the same side over a wide range of specific issues.

It would, however, be unjust to Emily to suggest that our positions on these issues rested on identical philosophical or theoretical bases. Most, if not all, of the time she had more confidence in the validity and applicability of "accepted" economic theory than I was ever able to muster. Stated otherwise, she could work "within the system" for social and labor legislation (minimum wages, unemployment insurance, health insurance and so on) without any sacrifice of principle. Both of us favored more "interference" with the allegedly free forces of the market than did many of our colleagues, but I had an uneasy -- and strong -- feeling that such an interference as the New Deal program was more or less superficial tinkering. After 1934, when I began a thirteen-year study of the Austrian working-class movement, I had little or no time to continue the cooperation with Emily on such a project as the Report and Recommendations of the California State Unemployment Commission which I had enjoyed so much in the summer of 1932. Fortunately for me we continued to exchange ideas frequently because we had adjoining studies in South Hall and because we were both members of the Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics -- the activities of which she discusses at some length in the following pages. Subsequently the bonds between her and me became closer and tighter in other respects, most specifically with reference to the nature and composition of the department of economics at Berkeley and to the trends in economics as a discipline.

As the reader will see, Emily returned as a member of the department on the recommendation of Professor Jessica Peixotto. At that time the department was extraordinarily well-balanced in the sense that it included an almost mathematically even number of representatives of different interests, points of view, and conceptions of what was important, and that the individuals respected each other and worked together more harmoniously than was usual in large departments. Generally speaking, and in terms of major interests, there were three groups: the theorists, the specialists in "applied" economics (banking, corporation finance and so on), and the "social" economists (programs of social reform, poverty, labor). Miss Peixotto was the center of the last group -- respected and loved by

all of us. Professor Ira B. Cross was a specialist in banking, with a strong interest in labor, who also offered the basic first course, Economics IA-IB. Beyond reasonable doubt his provocative lectures in that first course stimulated an interest in economics among more students than did those of any person of his generation. Moreover, he was the first individual on the West Coast to offer a course in personnel administration and is the author of a history of labor in California. In other words, he was in those days the most prominent example in our department of a teacher with a high degree of competence in a variety of areas within the discipline. And, as I hope my choice of words has made clear, we were blessed with others, including Emily.

Now, in literal translation of a much-used German phrase, it would be a "boundless exaggeration" to claim that the department of economics at Berkeley in the '20's and most of the '30's was a Garden of Eden. It was, as I have stated, well-balanced and generally harmonious. Just when* it acquired its serpent(s) is probably not significant; the fact that we did get it (them) is significant. Minor personality conflicts became major ones. The instance cited by Emily of the refusal to give tenure to a young "social" economist who might have succeeded her as chairman of the Heller Committee had been preceded by several others. The "theorists" began to take over and, in line with international trends, began to stress methodology - especially the use of elaborate mathematical techniques. One of our staff went so far as to state that no one should be allowed to take any economics courses until she or he had completed four years of solid mathematics. Emily, along with a substantial number of us, became convinced that the dominant group in our department and in the profession had forgotten that economics is about people. She vigorously resisted that development -- with less and less success.

Finally, two years before the regulations prescribed, Emily retired because "I simply could not nor did I want to become a mathematically oriented economist, and that was the vogue -- good or bad I won't try to guess." She will forgive me, I hope, when I suggest that the preceding clause is in some degree more a bow to the conventions of courtesy than a precise reflection of her feelings. In connection with the failure of her colleagues to support her efforts to keep the Heller Committee alive she says: "...with the interest of everyone in the economics department so far afield, I just gave up." And a few moments later in the interview: "...I still wonder whether any University research organization will concern itself with social problems which cannot always be turned into

*For some more positive convictions on this point see Professor Cross's volume in this series. Ira Brown Cross, Portrait of an Economics Professor, Regional Oral History Office, 1967.

mathematical symbols."

Of course I can't be sure that this was the only instance in which Emily "just gave up." But I can join with untold numbers of working people and professionals in thanks to her for the fact that she almost never did. Her patience and persistence in securing funds for the Heller Committee, in making pilgrimages to Sacramento to help secure social legislation, in providing facts and arguments for those with similar objectives, in helping to administer the department of economics and federal laws -- the list goes on and on -- deserves the warmest thanks.

Deliberately I have avoided the inclusion of some details that others might consider appropriate. As I see it, it is not the purpose of an introduction to skim the cream off the document. This would be particularly inappropriate in the instance of the "Oath Fight" of twenty years ago. One exception I have to make. To this day Governor Earl Warren is given credit for being a strong supporter of health insurance. He was -- in 1945. But in 1947 and 1949 he agreed to puny, hopelessly inadequate bills. Emily and her dear friend Professor Barbara Armstrong made frequent attempts, usually fruitless, to see him and reeducate him. When they did succeed, they got the impression that the chief thing he wanted from them was "to go away." Subsequently she helped to win that one.

Now, ten years after retirement, she must be deriving considerable satisfaction from the fact that many of the youngest members of departments of economics in Berkeley and elsewhere have become disenchanted with the heavy emphasis on mathematics and methodology. They know their calculus, thoroughly, but they know it is not the beginning and the end and the middle of economics; in fact, a considerable number prefer to call themselves "political" economists.

Charles A. Gulick
Professor of Economics, Emeritus

9 August 1971
University of California, Berkeley

INTERVIEW HISTORY

Emily Huntington's splendid house in the Berkeley hills provided the setting for these interviews. We usually met in her study, shaded by vibrantly colored liquid amber trees in the autumn, and the delicate Santa Rosa plum in the spring. Eight interviews took place on a weekly basis from December, 1969 through February, 1970. There were several intermissions occasioned by travel plans and mild illness.

As is routine in interviews of this kind, and after considerable research, I had some preliminary conversation with Miss Huntington about her career. We discussed her numerous interests and activities; some queries calculated to elicit an evaluation of events in which she participated were raised as well. Subsequently, I sent Miss Huntington a letter outlining the project interviews, with emphasis on those activities dearest to her: the long fight for sound social insurance policies, and her work with the Heller Committee.

After the initial interview, covering her childhood and education, Miss Huntington regularly prepared a lengthy statement, handwritten, covering the general subject scheduled for the particular interview. She was most gracious about interruptions for clarification and encouraged me to break into her recital with questions.

During the interviews, Emily Huntington emerged as a vigorous lady of frank, deeply held convictions which were a joy to encounter, and with a sense of humor about herself. The tape recordings indicate a clear, strong presence and a disciplined academic mind which hewed to the subject at hand. Miss Huntington did not like the idea of oral interviews, and said so, firmly and frequently. I believe that aspects of the oral interview, such as its tendency to be relatively informal and occasionally free-wheeling, were difficult for Miss Huntington to reconcile with her rigorous standards of academic professionalism.

When presented with the first editing of the taped manuscript, Miss Huntington was not at all happy. She was informed, as are all persons interviewed by the Regional Oral History Office, that she could make additions, deletions, corrections as necessary. In spite of assurances that the interview was developed as a primary source and was not intended as a definitive statement, Miss Huntington substantially revised the bulk of the document. Her conscientious handwritten labors were aimed at greater structural coherence and more precise expression of her ideas. The final product, I think, illuminates her life-long

concern with her work and her sense that results and high quality matter. But I, the interviewer, cannot help but wish that she had permitted a bit more of those endearing personal qualities that make Charles Gulick, Barbara Armstrong, Eleanor Dulles, and all the others such devoted friends and admirers peek through.

Alice Greene King,
Interviewer

17 August 1971
Regional Oral History Office
Room 486 The Bancroft Library
University of California, Berkeley

THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

IN RECOGNITION OF HIS MERITORIOUS ACHIEVEMENTS HAVE CONFERRED
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS UPON

EMILY HARRIET HUNTINGTON

GRADUATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AND DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY FROM RADCLIFFE COLLEGE · MEMBER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AT BERKELEY FOR MORE THAN THREE DECADES, SHE HAS WORKED UNTIRINGLY ON BEHALF OF HER DEPARTMENT AND FOR THE WELFARE OF THE ENTIRE UNIVERSITY THROUGHOUT HER YEARS OF SERVICE · CHAIRMAN OF THE HELLER COMMITTEE FOR RESEARCH ON SOCIAL ECONOMICS AND WIDELY RECOGNIZED AS AN AUTHORITY ON THE COST OF LIVING AND ITS CHANGES; ON HEALTH AND MAINTENANCE STANDARDS FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS; AND ON SOCIAL SECURITY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO HEALTH AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE · SHE HAS SERVED ABLY AS CONSULTANT TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AT LOCAL, STATE, AND NATIONAL LEVELS · HER UNIVERSITY IS HAPPY TODAY TO CONFER ON HER ITS HIGHEST HONOR FOR HER GREAT CONTRIBUTIONS TO STUDENTS AND TO PUBLIC AGENCIES ALIKE AND FOR HER CONSTANT GOODWILL AND HIGH PURPOSE AS A FACULTY COLLEAGUE.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF THIS DIPLOMA IS INSCRIBED WITH THE SIGNATURES OF THE
PRESIDENT OF THE REGENTS AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY, AND TO IT HAS
BEEN AFFIXED THE OFFICIAL SEAL

GIVEN AT BERKELEY THIS THIRTEENTH DAY OF JUNE, IN THE YEAR OF OUR
LORD ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOUR, AND
OF THIS UNIVERSITY THE NINETY-SEVENTH

Edmund G. Brown

GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA AND PRESIDENT OF THE REGENTS

Clark Kerr
PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

I FAMILY BACKGROUND AND EDUCATION

King: To begin, I'd like to ask about your family and how they came to California.

EHH: My father*was a Vermonter. He was born in 1847. He was the son of a minister. They were in and out of Vermont in various places where his father had his churches. His young life was spent largely in Vermont. He went to the University of Vermont in Burlington. He got his A.B. degree there. During his years at the University of Vermont, he worked in the summers on farms to earn his living because his family had very, very little. There were several children in the family, but he managed to get himself through the University.

And then—this was very unusual in those days—he went to Harvard Medical School. How he went through Harvard, from the point of view of support, I don't know. He must have had a scholarship. He couldn't possibly have done it otherwise. He graduated from the Harvard Medical School, interested in surgery from the very start. After serving his internship at Massachusetts General Hospital, he came out to Nevada to take over the practice of a relative of his who, through illness, had to give up his practice. He practiced in the mining area—horseback practice—for a number of years.

There was a story he used to tell. He was taking care of the miners, and this was the period when the miners had plenty of money; they were very prosperous and he was practically the only doctor in the area. A miner came in one day and my father examined him and said to the man, "You are a very sick man. You are suffering from appendicitis, and surgery is required. I have never done an appendectomy. I know how to do it. I've studied surgery. I can do surgery. I can do an appendectomy but I want to tell you I've never done one before; and if you don't want to chance it that's just too bad, because there's nobody here who can do it." So the fellow said, "Well, I'll probably be dead if I don't." My father said, "I think so. But you may be dead if you do."

The miner chose the operation, and he recovered. My father used to say, "My reputation was made." (Laughter) The miners all

* Dr. Thomas W. Huntington

EHH: around thought that a miracle had been performed.

He stayed in Nevada for a number of years, and while he was there met my mother. Her family came here in the Forty-Niner period across the plains in a covered wagon. She was, however, born in Dixon, California. Her name was Harriet Pearson. She went to visit her sister who had married and was living up in Nevada, and she met my father there. My mother was eighteen when they were married and my father was thirty-two or thirty-three—about fourteen years older than my mother.

Within a few years they moved to Sacramento and Father practiced medicine there from about 1880 or 1885 to close to 1900. They left Sacramento in 1899, when I was four years old and my brother was six. The reason for the move to San Francisco was that my father was asked to be on the faculty of the University of California Medical School.

King: By this time he had grown out of the "horseback practice!"

EHH: It was still the "buggy practice!" He went from horseback to horse and buggy! And then to cars. (Laughter)

King: And he was professor of surgery.

EHH: He was professor of surgery and practiced until he was 75. We only lived in two places in San Francisco. The first year or two we lived in a house on Sutter Street between Polk and Larkin where my father had his office. Then we moved to a home on Pacific Avenue and Scott Street which they bought and in which they lived throughout my whole childhood up through the university.

King: Could you tell me a little about your early education and your memories of school?

EHH: We moved to the house on Pacific Avenue when I was five years old. In October of 1901, I was six. And between October, 1901 and January, 1902, I was simply sitting on the doorstep waiting to go to school!

King: Was the school a public or a private school?

EHH: A public school. The Grant School, which is still in 1970 in the same location on Pacific Avenue three blocks from where I lived. From the very first day I could walk to school. In those days there was little traffic and as I recall no automobiles—so the danger to a child was negligible.

Grant School had a wonderful staff of teachers. There was a very, very famous first grade teacher. Her name was Miss Campbell. Several of my friends now in Berkeley remember her as a wonderful

EHH: teacher. She gave us the greatest joy. I have never had such excitement and pure delight in learning.

Most of the children in the Grant School came from the neighborhood in which I lived, and included very few of any minority race. At that time the chief minority races in San Francisco were the Chinese and Japanese, most of whom lived in segregated areas. But in my school there was one Chinese girl—a bright and delightful child, liked by all.

One morning I went to school and she wasn't there. I thought, "She's sick," but the weeks went on and she didn't come back. Finally I asked my parents. They told me that the day before she had left the school an ordinance was passed that no Oriental could attend a white school! All had to go to Oriental schools.

The fact that I remember this is important. I was disappointed that a schoolmate was no longer a member of the class. I was not old enough to recognize this as prejudice based on skin color, but the incident has often come to my mind as my first introduction to the problems of minority groups in our population.

When I reached the sixth grade I transferred to a private girls's school, the Sarah Dix Hamlin School. The reason I asked my parents to allow me to transfer to the Hamlin School was not because of any dissatisfaction with the public school but because I wanted to be with my special friends who were making the change. My father who believed in public schools objected but finally gave his permission, perhaps because he recognized the importance of close friendships to a child.

The new school under the direction of Sarah Dix Hamlin had high scholastic standards. It was in no sense a "finishing school," which was true of many girls's schools at that time. I had had excellent teachers at the Grant School, and this continued during my years at the Hamlin School through the completion of high school. We were always expected to do our work and do it well, but in the main the teachers were concerned not only in a lesson well-prepared but in stimulating our interest in the subject and in making school fun, not just a chore to be done.

The teacher I remember best was Miss Agnes Brown, a history teacher. Her classes were always interesting and exciting, with an atmosphere of pleasant competition between the students. It was through her encouragement that my interest in attending the University of California was stimulated. At the time I graduated from high school relatively small proportions of girls went on to college. In our class of about twelve, four were admitted to a university—three to California and one to Stanford.

King: Did your family encourage you to go on to college?

EHH: My mother did not want me to go to college, but to stay at home and be the daughter in the household.

King: What did a "daughter of the household" do?

EHH: I don't know what a daughter does in a household. I think clearly what she hoped was that I would marry. I had no interest in a purely social life, and it is impossible to guess what might have happened if I had been forced into boredom in a life contrary to my desires and interests.

King: College was not considered conducive to marriage.

EHH: No. College was not considered conducive to marriage, and I think that was probably what was behind my mother's objection to a college education. Of course, I know that she was always very disappointed that I didn't marry, and I used to say to her, "Anyway, there's one advantage. I am sure marriage is one of the best things that can happen to a person in life, but at least I won't feel devastated as you do (my mother) when your child leaves home. I won't have that agony!" (Laughter)

On the other hand, my father wanted me to go to college. I had always felt very close to my father. He had broad intellectual interests and his friends were widely scattered throughout the country. Several times when I was in high school and my mother because of ill health could not travel, my father took me to Medical Association meetings on the Atlantic coast. I enjoyed seeing the United States—the great open spaces as well as the cities—and meeting many physicians of whom I had often heard, including the Mayo brothers who were close friends of my father's.

When I entered the University at the age of 17, I had had good educational preparation, a pleasant home life and a little look at a few spots outside of California. I had never experienced the "freedom" of the present generation of young people. Although I was not really conscious of a somewhat restricted life, I do remember on entering college living away from home for the first time. I felt a sense of joy in what seemed to me a new freedom—and the opportunity to learn not only out of books but through contact with students and faculty whose experiences and backgrounds would in many cases differ from my own.

II STUDENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

EHH: When I entered the University at Berkeley in 1913, my plan was to major in history, the field in which I had become interested during my high school years. I enrolled in Henry Morse Stephen's course, History 1A, a broad survey course. As I recall it was described as covering ancient, medieval and modern history, but time did not allow for much beyond the medieval period.

Morse Stephens was a distinguished and highly respected member of the faculty. I was perhaps lacking in the ability to appreciate Professor Stephens's quality as a teacher. The fact is, however, that at the end of the semester of my first University course in history, my interest in this as a major field had disappeared.

We had a long and detailed printed syllabus and of course some outside reading which I often found interesting. But to my surprise as I sat with the syllabus before me, practically the same words came from the lecturer. I often said to myself, "To attend the lectures is a waster of time, but you are supposed to go to class--so I go to class."

Fortunately, my disappointment over my loss of interest in the study of history did not affect my desire to continue a University education. I took a wide variety of courses, including English, science, philosophy, and I enjoyed being part of the University community and making new friends. In my sophomore year I was fortunate to find a new field of interest--economics.

King: Did you find anybody more inspiring in the field of economics or in other parts of the University?

EHH: Oh! Yes! It was just history that I got so awfully sour on. In my sophomore year I took elementary economics. This course was given by Professor Carl Plehn. The lectures were quite dull, but the subject was new to me and thus my interest often overcame boredom. The lecture course of some 100 or more students was broken down into small groups of fifteen to twenty who met twice a week with a teaching assistant. I was fortunate in being assigned

EHH: to the section of Milton Dobrezensky, and he was the person who first excited my interest in economics.

He was a brilliant and a wonderful teacher. The meetings were never dull. He insisted on everybody entering into the discussion; he made everything exciting and interesting.

King: Was Mr. Dobrezensky interested in radical ideas?

EHH: I really don't know. He was a brilliant, stimulating young man, and he could make these rather dry ideas come to life. I have no feeling about his social philosophy at all. He later became a lawyer and practiced in Oakland for many years. I never saw him after I finished college.

Following my fortunate experience as a sophomore I was ready in my junior year to develop a real and lifelong interest in economics. By that time I was taking courses with several people in the department. There were two people in the department, Carleton H. Parker and Jessica Peixotto, who introduced me to economics as a field which deals not only with analytical techniques which are of course important but with economic and social problems of people.

King: What was the field in which Carleton Parker taught?

EHH: He taught courses in labor problems, his chief interest being in agricultural labor. At this time, about 1915 and 1916, his special concern was with working conditions in the hop fields where the conditions of work were indescribably bad. His knowledge was first-hand—he spent time in the hop fields and gave to his classes an accurate picture of the plight of those workers.

He was concerned not only with their economic, health and housing problems but with their psychological feelings and attitudes. He was widely read in the field of psychology, which at this time was unusual for an economist.

Among other books dealing with psychological problems, included in our reading lists were some by Sigmund Freud, whose ideas he believed were of importance in analyzing the psychology and attitudes of groups such as labor in the hop fields and elsewhere. At this time Freud was read by few outside the field of psychology.

Probably, as young students, we did not get the full import of the Freudian analysis and perhaps some were shocked by his frank discussion of sex. But with Professor Parker's guidance I think we all felt that we had benefitted in our understanding of human motives and behavior by the introduction to a type of

EHH: analysis new to us.

At all times Professor Parker was an interesting and challenging teacher. He also welcomed conferences with one or a few students. I suppose that now this would be defined as "free communication" between student and professor. In any case, we appreciated his interest in young people, whose knowledge often was meager, but whose enthusiasm for understanding the problems of labor was great.

King: Was he a socialist?

EHH: I don't know. But because of his concern about the problems of agricultural labor, I am sure that farm owners and probably employers of industrial labor feared that students of labor problems like Professor Parker might encourage workers to believe that something might be done to improve their wages and working conditions.

He probably was characterized by some groups as a radical, a socialist or some other term to indicate their feeling that University professors should stay in their libraries and not take a position on such problems as the relations between labor and their employers.

Whatever was the reason, within a few years, I don't remember just when, Carleton Parker disappeared from the University of California campus. As I recall we were told that he had accepted a teaching position elsewhere, but his students felt that he was probably, to say the least, encouraged to leave because his ideas were too advanced for his time. He died very young, just a few years after leaving the University of California.

During my four years I was fortunate to have some contact with several other professors in the department—among others Ira Cross and Henry Hatfield—but my longest and closest association was with Jessica Peixotto. She was the person most responsible for stimulating my interest in economics during my undergraduate years. She encouraged me and gave me confidence not only in finding interesting jobs after graduation but later in returning to college, Radcliffe, to complete the work for a Ph.D. degree.

Professor Peixotto's undergraduate courses were primarily in the field which has been described as social economics. I was a member of her course, which I think then was called "Family Budgeting," primarily an analysis of how and why families spend as they do. This would now be called the economics of consumption, but when I was an undergraduate there was still little development of the now broad and quite technical field of the economics of consumption.

EHH: A second course was called "Poverty." Although Jessica Peixotto had been brought up in a family where I understand there were no economic strains, she had real concern for the problems of the lower income groups. For some reason which I could never fathom, her interest seemed to be in the history of the treatment of the poor and the reasons for the existence of poverty in the early decades of the twentieth century.

There was almost no mention of measures, except a few which were really palliative such as aid to dependent children, which might be taken to prevent large numbers of our population from falling into economic disaster. For example, as I recall there was no mention of social insurance—usually paid for by contributions of worker and employer—as a way to prevent the injured, unemployed, old and ill from falling into poverty because of emergencies to which the insurance principle could properly be applied.

In spite of the limitations of this course, we learned much about the faults of our society. And the emphasis was always on the faults of society rather than as in the long existing English Poor Laws on the faults of an individual, irresponsible, or a lazy laggard.

Jessica Peixotto brought to her teaching an enthusiasm for her subject, a very wide knowledge of the literature in her fields. (We sometimes smiled a little when she would name three or four books she had read very recently—we were suspicious that she couldn't have read each book through—but her comments usually stopped our smiles.)

Again, as with Carleton Parker, Professor Peixotto had a real interest in her students. If a student at an informal conference expressed an interest in some special aspect of the course, she frequently gave us assistance in developing a small project. I was one of those students, and in working closely with her I came to know her well. From these early contacts grew a real friendship which lasted throughout her life.

One small incident I should like to mention although it occurred in 1920 long after I had graduated from the University, but it came about through my association with Professor Peixotto. As an undergraduate she had suggested that we read the works of Sydney and Beatrice Webb, who were long time friends of hers. I believe that I read most of what they had written at that time.

When I was in London, remembering my interest in the Webbs, Jessica sent me a letter of introduction to the Webbs. Eleanor Dulles and I were studying at the London School of Economics. We were invited to tea at the Webbs. The occasion was of no

EHH: particular importance, but it is always interesting to see people whose books you have enjoyed. The atmosphere of their home was warm and charming—with Sydney Webb (a very small man) sitting in a low chair on one side of the fireplace in an attractive Victorian "drawing room" and the tall Mrs. Webb in her tall chair on the other side.

I recall little about the conversation, except that in spite of the fact that we must have been just another two students, there was an air of cordiality and they gave us some advice as to places to go and things to see which might interest two students who wanted to become familiar with the life of London outside the "West End."

In present day language I guess what we wanted to see were areas where the "Establishment" don't live and work. Without the use of any such term, the Webbs steered us in the right directions.

King: Could you say something about your University life in addition to your work with Carleton Parker and Jessica Peixotto?

EHH: As I mentioned earlier I found great satisfaction in these years of freedom—in a minor sense, being on my own—and in the intellectual stimulus, often in a wide variety of new fields. I made many new friendships. I took almost no part in what were called "activities." I had no interest in sports or in serving on student committees. I was always too busy. I don't think I was a bookworm. I enjoyed a pleasant social life, but organized "activities" simply did not interest me.

Of course there were a few rough spots. I will mention one—an English course on Shakespeare, an elective course. I soon discovered that it was a majors course and required the ability to place and give the character responsible for long lists of quotations. This I simply could not do. My first examination was a dismal failure.

Frantically I went to Walter Morris Hart, the professor, and suggested that I should drop the course, although this was against my principles. He obviously recognized that I had taken the course because I wanted to know more about Shakespeare under the direction of a scholar. He urged me to continue in the course, which I did.

When the final came I was terrified, and I am sure I did not pass the part of the examination on quotations. Professor Hart must have taken into account the fact that I was not an English major and my earlier conversation with him. My grade was good—I can't remember just what it was. Some might think the professor was not justified in his action, but in any case I was not forced

EHH: to drop a course which I found interesting, although I wasn't quite able to meet the requirements.

King: How did you feel when your four years at the University were completed?

EHH: Graduation with a B.A. degree was of course a satisfaction—a purpose accomplished—a happy day, but with some regrets and fears. I was fearful of "what next?" I was determined to earn my living, although I knew that my father could support me, and would have been happy to support me at home.

But what I wanted was an independent life, financially as well as otherwise. How, what, and how much resistance to my desires to be on my own there would be from my parents, I did not know.

III EARLY WORKING EXPERIENCES

King: What did you do next?

EHH: As I have already mentioned, even before the day of my graduation in 1917 I had decided that I wanted to lead an independent life and to work. This was not because I was unhappy at home, but because I considered that I was an adult and I didn't want to live at home and just be a "daughter of the house."

I wasn't specially equipped for any kind of work. I had a major in economics, yes, but in those days, there weren't many jobs for people who had majored in economics. Many young women went to a business school and learned stenography and other office skills. That I knew was not my bailiwick. I didn't have any real interest in high school teaching or in all of the education courses which would have been required. I just wanted to work in some field in some way related to my interests developed in college.

I talked this over with Jessica Peixotto. We were at war, and it seemed to me there was a chance that I would be allowed to go abroad. But just at that point the federal government set a minimum age requirement of 25 for women who wanted to go abroad to work for war relief agencies. I didn't get under that limit.

So then, I remember, I said to Jessica, "I'm just going to leave and go someplace and get a job!" And she said, "Don't just up and leave right now. It's too soon after you graduated from college."

I suppose she would have been considered rather conservative in terms of family relationships and the desire of a young person to be "on her own." She said, "Don't do it. You'll find some things to do around here for a while, and see how things will go." I took Jessica's advice possibly because I realized I had no special training and no knowledge of how or where I could find work. What else could I do? I had no intention of running away, and my family certainly would not have cooperated financially or otherwise if I had set off for some place without any plans as to

EHH: what I would do when I arrived at my destination.

For a few months I did a little volunteer work for the Red Cross, some sort of routine office work, which to say the least was not stimulating, although it was probably considered a useful war effort.

Suddenly a call came from Jessica Peixotto. She had been requested by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics to recommend people as interviewers in the 1918-1919 cost of living study, and she wished to submit my name. This call came about mid week, and the job was to start the following Monday.

I had already agreed to go to Santa Barbara with my mother for a week or so, leaving two days after the call from Jessica. However after a moment's hesitation, my answer was, "Yes, I will report to work next Monday." My desire to get to work overcame my conscience. So after a mild family struggle I accompanied my mother to Santa Barbara, settled her in a hotel, and returned to report to work on Monday.

The study, for which I interviewed families in San Francisco-Oakland to get their incomes and expenditures for a year, was a nationwide study in industrial centers in the United States. It covered white families in 92 cities, in 42 states, to secure data which would show the living conditions of families in cities both small and large throughout the United States.

Information was obtained from 12,096 wage earner and low or medium salaried families (defined as having an income not over \$2,000. There was no earnings limit on wage earner families.) Scientific sampling techniques had not been developed, although it was of course recognized that efforts could be made to secure samples which could be expected at least roughly to represent the characteristics of the group studied.

The size of the sample varied with size of city—from approximately 500 in New York City to usually between 70 and 80 in small cities. The size of the sample was determined in Washington, but with certain guidelines the actual choice of families visited was left to the supervisor of the field staff.

The geographic areas with groups eligible for study were determined in conference with city officials and others knowledgeable as to the characteristics of the population in various parts of the city.

Interviewers were assigned to an area to be covered, and every house was visited and schedules obtained from those who were eligible and were willing to give the necessary information. This

EHH: procedure was continued until the required number of questionnaires had been obtained.

I am not aware of a record being kept of those who refused to cooperate, but my own experience both in San Francisco-Oakland and later in three other cities in which I was the supervisor of the field staff, was that very few refused to cooperate. And most seemed to be able to give reasonably accurate information as to their incomes and expenditures.

Throughout my life when I was doing research which required interviews, I was told, "They won't cooperate. They simply won't tell you their income or answer other personal questions." I always said, "If properly approached, and they understand the relevance of the questions and that the information will never be used with any identification of the individual, they will cooperate." And they did.

Completed schedules were checked and edited in the field and returned to Washington for computations and analysis. The tabulations were published in 1924, and did not include an analysis of how closely the sample represented the groups studied. But it is probably safe to assume that it provided a reasonably accurate picture of how wage earners and moderate salaried workers lived in cities in the United States in 1917-1919.

Earlier studies also before the techniques of sampling were available had made a similar assumption that the data fairly represented the occupational groups studied.

I worked as an interviewer on this 1917-1919 cost of living study for about two months when the number of schedules required were completed. There were about six or eight interviewers, all young and probably most without any work experience. We had a very competent supervisor sent from Washington. Our training was brief—a day or two and then we set forth.

I can of course only speak for myself, but to me it was an interesting, exciting experience. I had had no opportunity to know wage earner families or to visit their homes. Although we were not working in what might be characterized as slum areas, the homes were always very simple and frequently shabby. But I never had an unpleasant experience or a door slammed in my face.

Then as now the cost of living was uppermost in everyone's mind, and people were usually interested and pleased that the government had some concern about a subject as important as the cost of living. Perhaps to some extent my enthusiasm compensated for my lack of experience. At least this was my hope from the day I set forth on this first job, which came to an end in about

EHH: two months. Then the question was what next?

King: What did you do after this first job?

EHH: I was anxious to continue working and hoped that even my brief government experience might be of some help. Several months earlier Jessica Peixotto had been called to Washington to serve as Executive Secretary of the Womens Committee of the Council of National Defense.

Very soon a telegram from her came. "Would you like to come to Washington to work in my office?" My answer was yes and since the suggestion came from one of my professors and could be considered as "helping to win the war" my parents were willing if not enthusiastic that I should go to Washington.

In a few weeks I set forth, with all sorts of advice: what I should do if I got stranded in a city by myself, the caution necessary in train travel alone, and so on and so on.

Before leaving arrangements were made for me to live in a boarding house for women war workers run by a woman from one of the Eastern universities. The living arrangements were satisfactory although crowded, but this was unimportant. We were a group of young college graduates stimulated by all that was going on in Washington and all working hard and long hours in jobs which had an aura of importance to our country.

King: What was your job with Miss Peixotto?

EHH: I had arrived in Washington on Sunday. On Monday morning I reported for work. What I was to do I didn't know, but it was pleasant to find that there was a real need for a much needed "other hand." There was one secretary and no one else to help Jessica with her responsibilities for organizing the work of the Womens Committee.

As I recall at the time I arrived she was in the process of organizing action in the field of child welfare. My job was mainly sorting materials which were being submitted by various groups, drafting answers to letters, and writing brief reports and summaries of proposals for action.

After I had been in Washington six or eight weeks I succumbed to the flu, an epidemic which was striking down very large numbers. I was immediately hospitalized in someone's large home which had been donated for this purpose. Care was given in the main by Red Cross volunteers—certainly not trained nurses—but a very good job they did. A rapid and uncomplicated case was my good fortune, and I was back at work in two weeks.

EHH: When I returned I found, under a large pile of papers on my desk, a letter from Royal Meeker, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, requesting me to make an appointment to see him immediately. There was no hint as to the reason for this request, but I made the appointment at once and saw Mr. Meeker the following day.

His proposal was that I return to work on the Department of Labor's cost of living studies, as a continuation of the job I had done for a brief period in California. He asked me if I would accept a job as supervisor of interviewers in several cities in the Midwest.

I certainly did not feel that I had any real competence to supervise others when my experience was so brief. However, perhaps I realized as I did much later in World War II, that there were few persons with experience who were available during this war period. So I accepted in spite of my trepidations.

Before accepting I of course discussed the matter with Jessica. I would not have left without her approval. As always she was generous. She said, "Emily, of course I need you here, but you must accept this job. Not only is it very important work, but it will give you experience which will be of great value in your future."

King: Could you tell me something of your experience in this new job?

EHH: In November I left Washington—first to go to Chicago to work a week or so with the supervisor there. Then I set forth with about a dozen interviewers, none with much experience and some considerably older than I. But they were a fine and enthusiastic group, and we worked happily together.

We worked in Chippewa Falls and Green Bay, Wisconsin, Omaha, and Des Moines. The sampling procedures and interviewing techniques were the same as in the California study. With one exception my job as supervisor was not difficult; the interviewers were conscientious and determined to get the necessary information.

I of course was responsible for reviewing every case before sending it to Washington. I became suspicious that the schedules of one of the interviewers might not have been based on actual interviews. I assigned my best interviewer to check on the addresses, etc., and found that the schedules were of fictitious families. I reported this to Washington, and the interviewer was removed from her job.

This is the kind of problem which may turn up in any study, but I believe that such dishonesty seldom occurs and in most cases is not too difficult to catch.

EHH: The data for this cost of living study were not completed until several months after the Armistice in November, 1918. The field work for which I was responsible came to an end in about February or March of 1919. I then returned to Washington and for a month or two assisted in a review of cases from the field.

There were other jobs in the department, so my appointment was continued. I was quite aware that I did not have the training or experience to be assigned much beyond routine work. I was sure that this would be discovered in a peace time labor market, and I felt the need of some further educational background.

During a period of about a year and a half when I had been earning a salary, and also a per diem when I was in the field, I lived carefully, usually in boarding houses with perhaps a night in a hotel when I arrived. I saved my per diem. I now wanted to do some graduate work and thought that with my savings which I recall were approximately \$1,500, I could if I was granted a scholarship pay most if not all my expenses.

However, I did not want to return home after I resigned my Washington job in the early summer of 1919. I had been awarded a scholarship to do graduate work at Bryn Mawr College, but there would be an interval of about four months between the time I left Washington and the time I would enter Bryn Mawr in the fall.

I went to New York hoping to find a summer job. I had heard of the College Placement Service, so there I went and was immediately referred to the Metropolitan Life Insurance to be interviewed for a job which I think was called "research assistant."

Two men, Lee Frankel and Alex Fleisher, I think they were both officers of the company, were writing a book, The Human Factor in Industry. My undergraduate work at the University of California had given me an introduction to some of the problems about which I was asked to get together bibliographies and to draft materials to be included in several chapters.

It was an interesting summer job. I enjoyed research, but I continued to feel that I needed and wanted some additional education. My earnings on this job were \$25 a week, with an increase to I believe \$30. Apparently these authors were satisfied with my work, but I certainly was not equipped to make much of a contribution to the project.

Even though my time at the Metropolitan Life was short, it was an interesting insight into some aspects of labor relations in a large firm employing many hundreds of young and in the main untrained girls. Many I am sure were in their late teens and

EHH: probably a majority under 25.

I was interested in how much these girls earned, but the rule as stated in each payroll envelope was, "Earnings should not be discussed with other workers." I suspect that this was because wage rates were not standard for each occupational group, and were perhaps lower than general standards in the country.

I got a hint of this from a very competent stenographer who worked for me. One day I said to her, "I am interested to know how much people like you are paid. However I know that you are not supposed to tell me." Her answer was, "Certainly I will tell you, and I know that you will keep it in confidence."

Her earnings were much lower than the going rate in New York at that time which as I recall was about \$18 a week. This Metropolitan stenographer received as I remember \$14 or \$15 a week. I said to her, "Do you know that this is considerably less than a person of your competence could earn elsewhere?" Her answer was, "Yes, but I get free lunches, a nice rest room, a first aid room."

In the early 1920's a good many employers had adopted welfare programs, and in some instances there was an effort to substitute employer controlled welfare provisions for adequate wages. Even in 1920 Frankel and Fleisher in their book The Human Factor in Industry said, "The employer must face squarely that what the employee desires first is fair wages." It seemed to me however that Metropolitan had not as yet adopted this principle.

But certainly 50 years later trade union organization has to a large extent although not always forced employers to reject paternalism. I believe that Metropolitan still provides (or at least until very recently) "free lunches" and many other welfare programs.

These of course may be "fringe" benefits in addition to wages "at the going rate," but I don't know. I doubt that workers such as those are organized even now.

In 1919 I discussed this problem with Alex Fleisher. He said, "Go ahead and organize them." Fleisher's suggestion was, "Buy 100 lipsticks at the five and ten. Call a meeting and give them out with some advice about wages and wage rates." This of course I did not do.

King: You said a few moments ago that in the summer of 1919 you had been awarded a scholarship by Bryn Mawr College. I would like to know something about your year there.

EHH: In September I left New York and went to Bryn Mawr to enter a program of study in the field of employment management and labor problems. This program was directed by Anne Bezanson, a truly distinguished faculty member with a broad knowledge in her field. She not only taught us many facts we needed to know but stimulated our enthusiasm and an interest in scholarship.

I believe at this time only Bryn Mawr graduates were eligible to work for a Master's degree. Most of those in this curriculum were not working for a degree. Possibly we were granted some kind of certificate.

At this time the field of employment management was just beginning to develop. Miss Bezanson had organized such programs in a number of industries, and my interest rapidly grew in this as a possible field in which I might choose a career.

In addition to seminar discussions and reading, each student spent one day a week working in the employment department of an industrial firm. I was assigned to a large steel mill. Here I sat in on interviews, and had an opportunity to see a large steel mill in operation.

Not only did I become aware of the problems of choosing workers and assigning them to the proper job, but also of the dangers of working in areas where molten steel was pouring from furnaces. The workers had to be physically strong and hopefully to understand and follow safety measures.

At this time, 1920, trade union organization of steel workers was not strong, and it was a subject about which it was not advisable for a student to make many inquiries. I got the impression that in the period in which I worked the wages and working conditions were largely, if not entirely, matters for employer decision.

Even an untrained observer could see that although there were some safety regulations and signs posted, many things could have been done to reduce the dangers. For example, there were pieces of metal lying about which a worker hurrying from place to place could fall over and a serious injury result.

The hours were long—I believe a 48 hour week. The wage was a subject about which we were instructed to ask no questions. I am sure that now 50 years later with strong trade union organization, the conditions in steel mills and the wages of the worker are far better. However this industry, because of the nature of the product, will always be dangerous.

King: What did you do after the Bryn Mawr experience?

EHH: At the end of this interesting year—I believe that with one or two exceptions we all wanted jobs where we could at least try out our educational experience. By the end of the academic year Miss Bezanson was able to refer us to firms to whom she would send our recommendations and also told us that she was quite certain that we would be employed.

Following an interview I was offered a job at the Proctor and Gamble plant in Staten Island. In a few days I was at work. I think the title of my job was Assistant Employment Manager, or perhaps assistant to the Employment Manager. This plant employed men to do the manufacturing processes and a large number of girls to do the packing and the office work.

After a brief training period I was put in charge of hiring the women employees. I believe that this was the first time a woman had been employed in this position. The turnover of the women who did the packing had been very high, and perhaps they thought that a woman might have some luck in dealing with this rather uncertain labor force.

I soon realized that I was quite powerless when my only contact with these applicants was in the office of the employment manager. All the foremen were men, and they certainly lacked understanding of many of the problems. When the slightest difficulty arose, the girl would appear in my office with a dismissal notice signed by the foreman. There was nothing I could do once a girl was fired, usually after something of a scene with the foreman.

After several conferences I was able to convince the manager that the one hope I could give of any reasonable success in the job was to spend most of my time where the packing was done—as a sort of supervisor of women workers, or assistant foreman. This I did, and gradually the number of girls who either just quit or were fired was greatly reduced.

I had not been trained in any special techniques, so it must have been just plain common sense and watching to see what the troubles really were which came to my rescue.

King: Would you tell me something of these problems?

EHH: Yes, I will mention only a few. I found that when it was necessary to transfer a girl to a different room or to a different machine, the order was given and when she refused the foreman fired her. I soon realized that these girls soon developed an attachment to their particular place of work. Perhaps they had friends nearby, or they simply did not want to make any change.

EHH: I suggested a "flying squadron" of girls who would be willing to make these shifts. As an incentive they would be paid a small sum---this was five cents an hour--on a 35 cent hourly wage. I was responsible for choosing the "flying squadron" and for giving the orders, as requested by the foremen. It worked.

Another problem was when a girl first started to work on the belt line conveying the soap. She frequently suffered from "seasickness" or, more elegantly, motion sickness, which was increased by the odor of the soap.

It was evident that this usually only existed for a few days, so I established the right of a girl to request to be relieved of her work for an hour or two's rest at the plant, or to work only a few hours a day for about the first week. Some could never adjust to these jobs, but most could and did if they weren't fired without any chance of a period of adjustment.

There were other problems such as dealing with different national groups. A large portion were either Italian or Polish. I found the Italians volatile, quick to refuse; but soon they would be found doing exactly what they had been told. The Polish girls were often somewhat sullen and stubborn. The two groups had to be handled quite differently.

I, of course, had to convince the foremen that anything to do with the women must be referred to me. This took some doing, but most of these men were fundamentally decent and overworked. And when they found that I was not about to try to take any of the important prerogatives of their jobs, they were glad to be relieved of a lot of problems. They also appreciated a more stable labor force.

King: So you were their first counselor in industrial relations.

EHH: Yes. After I moved out of the office in the plant, the work was very interesting. However, even though I was young and in the best of health, a day which began at seven a.m. and often lasted until seven p.m. was too long. I found that I had to get there before the plant opened and stay until after it closed, and then face a jiggly and winding street car trip.

At the end of the day all I could do was to eat my dinner, fortunately at a very good boarding house near the pleasant room in which I lived, perhaps read a newspaper, or fall asleep over a few pages in a book. After about a year I decided that as a long-term career this was not the life for me.

This was also the conclusion of Eleanor Dulles, who had also taken the course at Bryn Mawr. She had been working in a hair net

EHH: factory on Long Island, and during part of my year on Staten Island she came to share my room. At least we had pleasant evenings together, and this was the beginning of a lifelong friendship, as close now as it was fifty years ago even though we have often been separated for several years at a time.

In our evenings on Staten Island we often discussed our plans for the future, and we both made a tentative decision that what we both craved was a life with some intellectual stimulation. We needed more time for a final decision.

Having heard a good deal of the London School of Economics, we decided to go to London—to attend the London School not as degree students but rather to give ourselves an opportunity to attend lectures in a variety of economic fields. We hoped to finally make a decision as to seriously starting toward a Ph.D. degree.

We had both been urged by Miss Bezanson at Bryn Mawr to work for a higher degree, but at that moment we wanted to work in the field in which we had been so interested in the year at Bryn Mawr.

King: When did you go to England?

EHH: We both resigned our jobs in the summer of 1921 and in a few weeks set forth for England. We each had some savings and a little from past gifts from our family, or in my case a small inheritance from an old family friend. We each had about \$2,000 and this seemed to be and was enough with our careful spending for a year of study and travel. We even ended the year with a few hundred dollars.

IV A YEAR IN ENGLAND--THE LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

EHH: We left New York in the late summer of 1921. For reasons of economy we chose a second class passage on the Olympic instead of a slow, one class boat. Eleanor's father, a professor of theology at Union Theological Seminary in Auburn, New York, came to see us off.

He was a little surprised at second class travel, but when he saw that our quarters were comfortable he said goodbye with no fear that we would have a miserable voyage.

We landed in Cherbourg and went directly to Paris, where we stayed for a week in a small hotel on the Left Bank. This was my first trip outside the United States, but Eleanor had been across the ocean once or twice before, so she was a fine guide.

This trip is one of my happiest memories--a brief but new and completely delightful experience to me. From Paris we went to Venice, Florence, Switzerland, Vienna.

King: When did you get to England?

EHH: We arrived in London in late September in time to get settled before the term at the London School of Economics started. We had been invited to share a flat in a building called Alexandra Mansions. It was hardly a mansion. It was near Kings Cross in what I think was described as a working class neighborhood.

"Our" flat was on the seventh floor. The halls were rather dreary stone floored passageways, and the elevator frequently broke down. The apartment was attractively furnished. The only heat was a fireplace, so it was certainly cold most of the time. But we soon learned to keep on sweaters and often coats even in the house.

EHH: The friend with whom we lived, Anne Tynan, was a trade union organizer who had a scholarship at Bryn Mawr when we were there. She was a delightful person, considerably older than we were, and her educational background may or may not have included a full high school course. I believe that she was granted the scholarship merely as an educational experience.

I think that Bryn Mawr has always been interested in having students from foreign countries, and Nan, as we called her, had held important positions in the trade union movement. Although probably lacking the formal educational requirements, she was well read and had a good mind. And added to this was her real charm. She was admitted as a special student, and although she was not a member of all the courses Eleanor and I took, we lived in the same house and we became very fond of her.

Our sharing the apartment with Nan was a great success. Eleanor and I had a pleasant room and shared the living room with the fireplace lighted in the evenings, and the kitchen. We were quite independent. Nan was working all day, and we were usually at the London School or the library, and often at the British Museum.

There were no arrangements about cooperative meals unless specially planned. We three had a pleasant companionship, and I believe that we all enjoyed sharing the apartment.

King: What did you do after you had settled the mechanics of living?

EHH: In the first few days we familiarized ourselves with London's transportation system and briefly saw a few of the famous spots—the Houses of Parliament, Westminster Abbey, Whitehall, the British Museum, etc.

Then we went to the London School of Economics to pay the necessary fees and register as non-degree students. We were told that we could attend any of the courses and could arrange with the professor to take part in class discussions and to have conferences with him for advice and assistance in pursuing our studies.

In other words, we would have the same privileges as a regular student. All of the professors were pleasant and cooperative. Several invited us to tea at their homes and in other ways made us feel "at home."

King: Who were the professors you remember best?

EHH: There were many distinguished professors as well as a number of interesting people who lectured at the London School of Economics. The ones whose courses I attended regularly were three with whose

EHH: work I already had some familiarity: John A. Hobson in the field of economic and social problems; R. A. Bowley, a distinguished statistician, a considerable portion of whose work was in such fields as unemployment and the measurement of poverty; and R. H. Tawney, the economic historian whose book, The Acquisitive Society, I had just recently read.

Others whose lectures I attended were Hugh Dalton, later Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Harold J. Laski, a political scientist and economist.

In addition there were frequent lectures by such distinguished people as Sydney Webb and George Bernard Shaw. Often the lectures were under the sponsorship of the Fabian Society. I believe a good many of the professors at the London School of Economics in 1922 were Fabians, that is Fabian Socialists—a term difficult to define.

Membership in this society required no orthodoxy but mainly a general belief in equal opportunity for everybody, freedom of discussion and inquiry, and the use of democratic processes. The Webbs's researches were particularly directed toward those in severe economic and social distress. Their aim was not just to show vividly what was wrong but also to bring about reform. And afterwards, though usually some years later, the shock of the conditions they described did bring about reforms in many areas, including the Poor Laws, the educational system, and many others.

I do not recall the exact subject of any of Sydney Webb's lectures I heard, but always he had impressive facts and statistics, which would at least give a person "pause for thought" when later he might find some reform measure to be voted on.

I only heard George Bernard Shaw about twice. He was always humorous and sometimes used sarcasm. Once I heard him speak on the post office. The only thing I remember now is that the speech was full of humor, but clearly an exposure of inefficiencies.

King: What sort of a program did you set for yourselves after you had registered at the London School of Economics?

EHH: Eleanor and I both attended courses with the professors I have mentioned above and occasionally dropped in to hear other professors. The professors in the courses we attended regularly were generous in talking with us, giving us advice in choosing subjects in which we particularly wanted to read widely, giving us bibliographies and introductions to the British Museum library and other sources of information.

I have said we were in England to make a decision as to our

EHH: interest in the field of economics and to see if we developed a special interest. We both found economics a field which had strong attraction, and we attended many of the same courses. By the end of the year I found that my special interest was in the field of labor and social and economic problems. Eleanor began to develop a great interest in the problems of finance, money, banking, and allied fields.

We also both recognized the need for further groundwork in economic theory. This we later got at Harvard.

King: Did you do any work outside the London School of Economics?

EHH: Yes. In the course of this year, one of our professors, I cannot remember which, suggested that we might be interested in doing some interviewing for a study of unemployment in the East End of London. This study was under the direction of a group from Toynbee Hall, a settlement house.

In January and February, 1922, we visited 155 home workers in the East London boroughs of Bethnel Green, Poplar, Shoreditch, and Stepney. These were areas in which the low skilled and poor lived and which had been severely hit by the depression of the 1920's.

A sample of names was drawn from official lists of home-workers so that the trades were represented in proportion to the numbers employed in the various trades. A large proportion, over 70 per cent, were in the garment, box making and boot making trades.

We were given a list of homes to be visited, and a list of questions to be asked which included a few general questions such as age and family composition, and a series of questions on employment or unemployment, wages, and other sources of income, and the cost of living.

Over half of the workers we visited had been seriously affected by the industrial depression. They were either unemployed or had a small amount of part time work. However even those with full time employment had meager earnings, and any slight increases they had received during the war had been more than cancelled by increases in the cost of living.

Clearly families with no earnings were in real distress, trying to eke out an existence on very small sums from unemployment or other kinds of relief. They probably had too little of everything, including food for adequate nutrition.

Those with earnings were of course somewhat better off. But even our brief visits showed that their struggles were great to

EHH: find food they could afford to buy, to replace worn out garments, and to rent even their dreary housing. Practically nothing was left for anything else.

All of the families we visited lived in narrow grim streets with small row two story houses on both sides. Although these houses were shabby and showed need of repairs, most of the people seemed to have pride in the appearance of their home. If we visited in the morning we would always see women with a bucket and cloth washing their two or three front steps.

We introduced ourselves as working for Toynbee Hall and said that our concern was with the problem of unemployment. I can remember no instance where we were not asked pleasantly to come into the house and let them tell us of their problems, often with the offer of a cup of tea in a shabby little room, but one usually neat and reasonably clean.

In spite of being discouraged and depressed, perhaps again pride prevented them from falling to the lowest depths of disorder and dirt.

We had been told that these people would be suspicious of our American accent. Most often if any remark was made it was, "You must come from northern England or Scotland." Our answer was of course, "No, we come from the United States," which seemed merely to interest them and caused us no trouble. In spite of the fact that the English are particularly wary of anyone prying into their personal affairs, these people seemed to be glad to tell us of their difficulties during the depression of the 1920's.

Clearly Eleanor and I made no great contribution by doing this small piece of work. But it did at least give us an insight which we could otherwise not have had into the lives of a very low income group of people, often with the burden of unemployment.

King: What did you do after your year at the London School of Economics?

EHH: We were anxious to visit factories in the Midlands area of England. We had both visited a number of factories in the Eastern United States, but all we knew of English industry was what we had read. Again the professors at the London School of Economics were glad to write to managers of about 25 factories for permission for our visits, and they gave us letters of introduction. The doors were always opened to us.

We visited cotton mills around Manchester and Birmingham, silver manufacturers in Sheffield, pottery manufacturers in Arnold Bennett's "Five Towns," and a chocolate manufacturing company. We of course wrote in advance for appointments. When we arrived the

EHH: manager was always cordial and even seemed pleased to show two young and certainly not very knowledgeable students the workings of his plant.

One minor problem frequently arose. A number of the larger plants had kitchens where food was prepared for the employees, and it was assumed that women would be most interested in seeing the kitchens. Of course we showed polite interest, but as quickly as possible we steered our course into the plants. A little time was wasted but that is all.

King: I would like to hear your general impressions of the factories you visited.

EHH: I can give you some general impressions. Eleanor and I learned a lot, perhaps in the main confirming what we had learned from books. Often to see is better than just to read; however, we had no idea of writing a book about the industrial system in England.

Many of the factories we visited were old. They had perhaps been built as long as 50 years ago or even more. There was of course some modernization, a few quite modern, in 1922. In most instances part or all of the machinery had been used for many years. Often there were both old and new machines in the same plant.

The new machines were much more automatic than the old ones which required much greater skill and more labor. This was particularly true in cotton manufacturing. There were also some instances where one small area was still a handicraft shop.

For example, in one of the silver manufacturing plants in Sheffield, there was a courtyard with small shops facing the court on all sides. We saw this from a window of the plant and asked, "What is going on there?" The manager said, "I will show you." We there saw old and often very old men each working alone in his little cubicle or shop making hand-wrought silver spoons, forks, etc.

In the language of the manager, "These men have been with us throughout their working life. They won't or can't work on machinery, so we set up these work shops for them (there were perhaps 20), and as each one is no longer able to work, and this is usually not until he dies, his "shop" will not again be used."

In the Wedgewood plant, certain types of work were in the hands again of old men usually with a young girl to assist in making the delicate designs to be used on Wedgewood vases and bowls. The rest of the plant was mechanized but still required

EHH: a good deal of the skill of a handicraftsman. But I suspect that by this time many more of the operations are mechanized.

The only really modern and spic and span factory we saw was the Rowntree Chocolate factory in York. This was a plant in a park-like area and a surrounding "company town." It is owned by the Rowntree family, obviously with great wealth and concern with the welfare of not only their workers but of the population in general.

One of the most famous studies of poverty was made by B. Seebohm Rowntree in the city of York in 1899, and he followed this with a number of later studies. Perhaps this concern about the plight of the working class led to the determination to provide good working conditions in the Rowntree Chocolate plant.

The conditions of work were certainly of the best: light, attractive work rooms, lunch rooms, recreation rooms, etc. They provided pleasant houses close to the plant, but each with a garden and looking over a park-like area.

We of course knew that company towns are not always what they seem to be. Homes are subject to inspection and often supervision. If there is a company store where workers must make their purchases, the worker will not have the choice of buying where he pleases and seeking out lower priced stores.

We could not of course ask "leading questions," but we were told that inspections were made at regular intervals and measures taken if the homes were not taken care of in a manner considered proper by the company. We could get no information on many important matters; for example, comparisons of wage rates with other plants in the area, the actual frequency or severity of inspections, and the rents paid.

When we went inside the factory we saw the workers in immaculate uniforms. They worked fast, but there seemed to be no "stick over their heads." Of course I don't know, but I suspect that in 1922 this was a pleasant place to work. I doubt that many of the workers, a considerable number of whom were women, were greatly dissatisfied, even with the inspection, which was probably not excessively arbitrary and done with what might be called a "welfare manner" or kind paternalism. (As I was in this plant, I recalled the attitude of the workers at the Metropolitan Life in New York.)

I suspect that in the period between 1922 and 1970, when labor has become much more knowledgeable and strongly organized, that the same or even better conditions of work probably exist in this plant. It is probable, however, that the control over

EHH: the lives of the workers outside the plant has become very different. It may be that the houses which were then rented are now sold to employees and that the management of the housing area may now be in the hands of a committee of workers. In the United States there were some company towns in the 1920's, seldom as elaborate as this one in York, but most have disappeared.

The hours of work were long in most of the plants we visited. For example, in the cotton plants, the workers came to work at six a.m. At seven there was a half hour break for breakfast. Tea was served mid-morning and afternoon on carts brought to the worker's side, and there was a one hour lunch period. As I recall the workers went home at five o'clock, an overall period of eleven hours, and a work day of approximately nine hours in a five and a half day week.

In most other plants which we visited the workers did not report to work as early as six o'clock, but our impression was that the usual work week approximated 48 hours and about nine hours a day.

All of the workers in these plants as far as we could determine were English and usually lived in a city or town nearby. In one case we could easily have misunderstood a statement about the source of the workers. The manager pointed to a women's dormitory for foreigners. We asked, "From what countries?"

His answer was, "They come from towns too far distant for daily travel, perhaps fifteen to twenty miles away. We have no one from any other country." A strange use of the term foreigner, but it must be remembered that at that time there were few immigrants coming to England.

Our advisers in London suggested that we be cautious about asking about wages, so we didn't. The general appearance of the workers did not indicate that they were suffering under the worst conditions of employment or excessively meager wages in terms of the wage scale of England. It of course must not be forgotten that we were seeing employed people, although there was heavy unemployment in England.

In Manchester and Birmingham we often saw workers leaving work or in the streets of the city. It was easy to pick out a "working class person," the man in shoddy trousers and a sweater and cap, the woman in a dark skirt, usually black, and sweater or blouse and often a shawl over her head. Coming out of the textile factories were many with wooden clogs because of the damp floors in textile mills.

EHH: In the United States at this time, a girl or a man coming out of a factory, unless they happened to be dressed in special work clothes, was dressed in the same style if not the same quality as other people in the streets from a higher economic level. Fifty years later this has undoubtedly changed in England.

However in 1920 and still in 1970, the mass production of ready-made clothes in the United States has made it possible for all to dress in similar style, although of course not the same quality or perhaps "high style."

Certainly in 1920 and probably even now, class distinctions were more clear cut in England than in the United States. We often heard people, even our friend Nan Tynan, say, "We are working class people." Perhaps this to some degree accounted for the fact that dressing differently was accepted as part of being a member of the "working class." This is probably less true today in England, but some remnants may still exist.

Perhaps it is redundant to give our impression of English industry, which has been widely written about. It was not surprising to find that many factories were operating in very old buildings unsuitable for modern methods of production--using out-of-date machinery and plant equipment, with old-fashioned ideas of management efficiency. Thus economical mass production of goods was impossible and labor, always an important cost, had to be kept at a minimum.

When we were there England's economy was depressed and the unemployment heavy, and there was little incentive or ability to improve plant management and equipment or to increase wages or to improve the housing and other social conditions of workers.

Between 1922 and 1970, much has changed in England. Particularly since World War II at least some and probably many industries have been able to modernize plants and improve efficiency. Workers have been able through strong trade union organization to get higher wages and better employment conditions. And the government has built large numbers, although not enough, dwellings for low income groups.

I am certain that a similar trip to factories in England in 1970 would show a narrowing of differences between England and the United States. England's economy, however, has had and still has difficult going. She has a long way to go to bring the standards of living of the vast majority of her population up to the United States.

She has, however, in some instances taken more effective steps than have we to tackle the problem of poverty. Since the

EHH: National Insurance Act which became effective in 1948, the aim in Sir William Beveridge's terms has been "to provide security from the cradle to the grave." Although this aim has not been completely reached, it has gone a long way in providing protection against dire poverty.

King: What did you do after this trip of factory visits?

EHH: We returned to London to have a few weeks seeing our new friends, enjoying the theatre, museums, and revisiting all our haunts of the past year. I think it was early September when we sailed back to the United States and then to Cambridge where we were due to register at Radcliffe.

V GRADUATE STUDIES AT RADCLIFFE AND HARVARD

King: By the time you left England, had you and Eleanor decided to continue with your graduate studies at Radcliffe?

EHH: Yes. We arrived in Boston and prepared to enter Radcliffe College. First of all we had to find a place to live. We both decided we didn't want to live in Cambridge; we preferred to live in Boston. We found an apartment on Beacon Hill.

King: Was there some reason for that?

EHH: Well, I certainly wouldn't call it the reason that would be given at the present time. But we had been living in England together for a year, without institutional arrangements of any sort, and we decided that we'd rather have an apartment. We had never actually had an apartment of our own, so we had fun.

We found an apartment. We bought furniture—unpainted furniture—for almost nothing. We went to some kind of an Army store and bought cots which no one in the world would sleep on nowadays. (Laughter) But we were very happy. We had a charming apartment. It was an old house on Beacon Hill. It was attractive.

Having found a place to live, out we went to Cambridge to pay our fees and register. I don't recall anything about the registration at all, except that we went in and presented ourselves and probably our records of earlier University work. There seem to have been few formalities.

Both of us were graduate students, and we were fortunate to be in the field of economics; not just because we liked it, but because women graduate students in economics were allowed to take courses at Harvard. In those days, the two institutions were quite separate. Many departments would not admit graduate women students to attend courses at Harvard.

For example, women graduate students in the English department had to attend the same course but given at Radcliffe for women by the Harvard professor. We thought that it was at least possible

EHH: that professors would have more enthusiasm in their Harvard course than in its repetition at Radcliffe.

In addition, the number of women taking graduate work in any field was small, often perhaps four or five. Clearly small classes are desirable, but less than ten except in unusual circumstances is often too small. If all the small number are very bright, really interested, and with some background in the subject, discussions among a very small group may prove entirely satisfactory. However the chances of a really stimulating very small group of students are slight.

The Harvard graduate classes in economics were not large—usually from ten to twenty—although there was one quite large lecture course, Economics 11. We felt that our being part of a group of reasonable size, with a variety of educational backgrounds, was probably more stimulating than attending a very small "second run" of the course.

King: Why do you think the economics department was so nice to women?

EHH: I don't know why the economics department allowed women to attend Harvard graduate courses. I think it was probably simply because it was less trouble than repeating the courses at Radcliffe. There were two professors however who gave us the impression that they were not enthusiastic about having women in their classes.

Professor Taussig insisted that the women—there were four or five of us—should sit together on one side of the room, instead of in the alphabetic seating order of the men in the class. This did not seem to result in discrimination in our taking part in the discussion periods, but we did not like being set apart.

Professor Bullock obviously did not care for women. Frequently he, without any relevance to the subject being discussed, commented on the lack of logic in female reasoning. These were always supposed to be bits of humor. For example, "Women always want a house with southern exposure on all four sides." However he tolerated us.

King: Did you study with Professor Taussig?

EHH: Yes. Every first year graduate student in economics took his course—Economics 11. He was, in those days, the dean of economics throughout the country. It was a course in economic theory; really, what you would call classical economics, which today is considered outmoded. Even before Taussig's retirement he began to be considered a less than great economist.

He was a very fine teacher. He used what, I presume, might be called the Socratic method. He lectured for a brief period, and

EHH: then called on students to discuss usually a question which had been answered in different ways by writers of distinction. He demanded brief answers and was insistent on careful expression of ideas and always on good logic. He was a severe critic, and unfortunately some students were frightened into silence.

Our basic text was Alfred Marshall's Principles of Economics, published in 1890. Taussig was concerned that we should understand not only Marshall's own neo-classical economic theories but also those of the earlier famous English economists: Adam Smith, Ricardo, and John Stuart Mill. Marshall's work was a bridge between these classical economists and the criticism of orthodox economics beginning in the 1930's.

Although Taussig's teaching was somewhat mechanistic, I have always been grateful for the introduction to the development of economic analysis. As in any field, new ideas seldom develop without some dependence on those which have come before.

King: What other professors did you study with at Harvard?

EHH: We were required to offer three fields in addition to economic theory for the written qualifying examinations for the Ph.D. degree, and a field of specialization for the thesis. The men who taught these courses were Professor Bullock, history of economic thought; Professor Edward Day, statistics; and Professor Usher, economic history.

In the second year I continued my studies with these and other professors: Professor Allyn Young, economic analysis; and Professor William Z. Ripley, labor economics.

The person for whom both Eleanor and I had the greatest admiration and even real affection was Professor Allyn Young, a true scholar whose interests were broad. He was warm and friendly in all our contacts with him.

In his second year seminar in economic theory, Young was much more concerned with the application of economic analysis to problems rather than with narrow and often quite unreal assumptions that "all other things remain the same." In other words, Young, although of course using his fine theoretical analysis, always made us aware of the complexities and interrelationships in the workings of a modern industrial society.

Even in his second year course in statistics, and he was a mathematician as well as a statistician, he never limited his discussion for example to the techniques of sampling but always included vivid examples of the problems of actual applications of theories and techniques.

EHH: I do not recall that Professor Young was actually assigned to Eleanor and me as our advisor, but in any case he was just this. He was our mentor throughout our years at Radcliffe-Harvard. Eleanor and I both felt that our training at Harvard was excellent. Of course it would now be considered "old-fashioned."

In the 1920's there was no course in mathematical economics. Clearly more mathematics than we had soon became important for economic analysis, and for a few years mathematics pretty well took over economics.

In recent years I think fortunately there has been some reversal of this trend which resulted in students to a considerable extent losing interest in such fields as economic history, labor, and courses dealing with such social problems as poverty, labor, social insurance, etc. Clearly some mathematical analysis is essential in every field, but not to the exclusion of other analytical techniques.

After two years and part of one summer I took my general examinations and was then ready to write my thesis—a history of wages in the cotton manufacturing industry. Although I presumably was to work under Professor Ripley, he was away at this time and Professor Young suggested the subject. It was interesting, but I quite often wished that I had chosen a somewhat broader subject. However once I was started I continued it to completion.

Most of the time I was writing my thesis I was teaching part time in the economics department at Simmons College in Boston. I was very glad to do this—first to get some experience in teaching, and second to earn enough to live on without the allowance from my father (\$125 a month) during my first years of graduate work.

King: Was there any possibility of a part time teaching job at Radcliffe or Harvard?

EHH: The answer to this is not for women. Many of the men graduate students were given teaching assistantships—I think they were called teaching fellows—but these appointments were never given to women. There were about half a dozen women graduate students in economics, and there was surely at least one and perhaps more who would have been highly qualified.

At the time I thought how unfair it was not to give this woman a chance. She was certainly brilliant, had an attractive and outgoing personality, and may already have had some teaching experience. But to offer her this was unthinkable in the 1920's. I may even have mentioned this to her, but if I did she accepted it as inevitable.

EHH: Although times have changed and there are now some women teaching assistants, it is still at least probable that women are not given an equal chance with men for the valuable experience plus the financial importance of a teaching assistantship.

King: Will you tell me something more of your life in Cambridge and Boston? Was it all work? Were there some problems? I gather that you were there to study and do your best, but certainly study was not your entire life.

EHH: Of course we worked hard—spending every day except Sunday and an occasional Saturday at Cambridge with many hours in the Widener Library. As I recall we never used the Radcliffe Library. We were assigned cubicles in the Harvard library, and this was not only convenient but gave us an opportunity for many valuable discussions with the men in the class.

There was, however, severe competition between the graduate students in economics (probably also in other fields), and our interest in discussing questions which arose in our reading or in class sometimes did not meet with enthusiasm, to say the least. Perhaps this was in part because we were women. Some may have feared that our interest might be romantic rather than intellectual. This, however, did not prevent many good discussions with some of our fellow students.

We had some but not a great deal of social life with the men in our class. Perhaps because we were all too busy with our studies, but more probably we were considered too "serious" to be good social companions. I must say that this did not seem to worry either of us. Perhaps it should have.

As I have said, there seemed to be only a few minor instances in which the professors did not make us feel quite welcome. There was, however, one discrimination, although to me minor. We were not permitted to work in the Widener Library after seven p.m. Some were distressed by this rule, and now I expect there might be a "confrontation."

My feeling was, "We knew this when we came. Why make a fuss about it?" I expect that now the students would say, "We are going to settle this and right now."

Perhaps in the 1920's Eleanor and I and I suspect most women realized that in a "man's world," which Harvard was at that time, we would sometimes just have to say, "We are lucky to have this educational opportunity," and forget the rest. Be that as it may, Eleanor and I and I think other women felt that we were getting the education we wanted and working with some of the best scholars in the field we had chosen.

King: What did you do in your "leisure hours?"

EHH: The answer to this depends on the meaning of "leisure hours." After our days in Cambridge we returned to Boston by subway, then a pleasant walk (except in mid-winter) across the common to our apartment, frequently going to one of the excellent but inexpensive small restaurants on Beacon Hill. Often a friend or two joined us. Then back to our studies in the evening.

This sounds like a dull life, but not to us at that time. We had a number of friends with varied interests whom we saw frequently, but we certainly did not have an active social life.

Occasionally too much concentration on our studies made us restless, and so off to the country we would go for a few days--in the summer to Marblehead and in the winter to some mountain spot, where we learned snow shoeing (now this would be skiing).

Of course Boston had much to offer--inexpensive symphony and good theatre. Even though we had to spend carefully, we always seemed able to have all the leisure time activities that we really wanted. We never felt deprived or socially isolated. Perhaps we were too serious about our work, but we did not feel that we had removed ourselves from the world.

VI TEACHING ECONOMICS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

King: Did you have any plans for the future when your studies at Radcliffe-Harvard were nearing completion?

EHH: Yes. I wanted to teach in a university where there would also be an opportunity to do research. I knew it was not customary to apply for university teaching, and my question was, 'Would my professors help me?'

King: What actually happened?

EHH: In the spring of 1928, to my complete surprise, a job offer came from the University of California. A letter came from Jessica Peixotto, with whom I had kept in close touch since my graduation ten years earlier, which said, "I have been delegated to offer you an instructorship in our department and to ask you to let me know whether you would be interested."

Of course I was pleased at this offer from my alma mater. I delayed my answer for a day or so, only because I was not entirely certain that I wanted to return to the west coast. But my answer was yes, and I never for a moment regretted the decision. I soon received my appointment papers as an instructor with the understanding that my Ph.D. degree would be granted in 1929.

King: When did you return to Berkeley? And what courses did you teach?

EHH: In the summer of 1928, in time to be ready to teach in the fall. I found a small apartment near the campus, although my family wanted me to live with them in San Francisco.

Then I conferred with Jessica and others of my colleagues in the department and was assigned a study on the top floor of South Hall. Within about a week I was at work preparing bibliographies, reading lists and lectures for the courses I was to teach--upper division economic theory, problems of poverty which had been Jessica's course, and a course in population, which at that time included great emphasis on our problem of immigration.

EHH: Although I had just come from a long period of study, and various members of the department gave me assistance in preparing appropriate materials, I had to work long hours and fast in order to start teaching in about two months. It was a real challenge I had to meet, but by the opening of the semester I had at least a good start on my teaching plans.

The first year was certainly not easy, and I am sure that the students were often quite breathless in trying to keep up with what I expected of them. This is probably often the fault of teachers quite new to their profession. At the end of the year I at least hoped that my enthusiasm in working with students, many of whom appeared to be eager to learn, may have overcome some of my faults of inexperience.

Two of my classes were quite small, 25 to 30, and one-- problems of poverty--much larger, about 80 students. Although my brief experience at Simmons College was with small classes, about ten or fifteen students, I found no serious problem in handling larger numbers. However there is always the difficulty of student participation if there are more than 25 to 30 students.

King: Were there any department requirements or guidelines as to the subject matter to be included in each course?

EHH: Yes, for courses sections of which were taught by several people. A committee of the faculty chose the textbook for the upper division course in economic theory and the general outline of materials to be covered, but the teacher of each section was free to assign other readings. He could use his own judgment as to the best way of getting across to the students the fact that practically every theory on how our economic system works is subject to qualifications and exceptions.

This is not easy, but I did not find it impossible if relatively simple illustrations are used which presumably can be understood by the student from his own experience, even though limited.

The content of courses taught by only one person was left to the person teaching the course. However from time to time the chairman asked for outlines of the course, and if a department committee had suggestions they were given to the teacher. I don't think that the course outlines were inspected in any routine manner.

All of us, I believe, asked colleagues for advice about course content. But we certainly did not spend our time hunting for each other's faults. There was always an attitude of mutual respect.

EHH: As I have already mentioned, from my first year here I took over the course problems of poverty, which Jessica had taught for many years. Of course I discussed the content of this course with her. She was most generous in her advice about content, bibliographies, and also teaching methods.

I continued to teach this course to my retirement, but gradually changed its emphasis from what are the causes of poverty to what can be done to prevent or at least reduce greatly the deprivations of large numbers in our population.

King: Did other universities have courses such as the one you have described?

EHH: This course was very unusual in an economics department. Some of the subject matter may have been included in courses in labor and probably in some courses in sociology. Economic analysts had little interest in the problems and deprivations of the low income population until well into the 1930's.

In the depression of the 1930's, John Maynard Keynes and others began to analyze the effects of low incomes not only on those with meager incomes but on the whole population. They examined the importance of the size and uses of income available for consumption and special problems of developing and underdeveloped nations.

King: As the years went on, were there any changes in the courses you taught?

EHH: Yes, there were changes. I had developed a strong interest in social insurance, which originated when I was an undergraduate, and my year in England was an introduction to their fast-growing but incomplete social insurance.

I was successful in convincing our economics department to permit me to reestablish a course in social insurance which had been offered by the department more than ten years earlier but which had been allowed to lapse.

Several years after I came to Berkeley I began teaching a course in consumption economics. During my undergraduate years I had been interested in how people spend their money. This was the subject of Jessica Peixotto's course in family budgeting. Then came my work with the Bureau of Labor Statistics on studies of incomes and expenditures.

The next thing that stimulated my interest in this field was my opportunity to assume some responsibility for the work of the Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics, which had

EHH: been established by Professor Peixotto in 1923. An annual donation for this small research organization came from Mr. and Mrs. E. S. Heller, very old friends of Jessica's and often generous benefactors of the University.

Later occasional relatively small grants came from a number of sources--the Rockefeller Foundation, the University Institute of Social Sciences, and the Bureau of Business and Economic Research. In the later years, from 1946, the University each year allocated sums of varying size to the Heller Committee.

For many years Jessica had been interested in how families earn and live, and she guided the research of the Heller Committee into studies in this field. By the time I came to the University, Jessica's health was not very good and she was anxious to be relieved of some of her responsibility for the research of the Heller Committee. I feel sure that she also wanted to give me an opportunity to at least share in research in a field in which I was interested.

About a year after I came to Berkeley, on Jessica's suggestion I was made a member of the Heller Committee. My first responsibility was to draft a report on incomes and expenditures of street car workers. The data had been gathered under Jessica's supervision, but poor health prevented her from writing up the report. She was still teaching, so I had her advice in writing the report.

For several years I was acting chairman of the Heller Committee. In 1935 I became chairman; and although it was not customary for a committee chairman to serve more than about four years, my appointment continued until I retired.

The reason for this was that Mrs. Heller's interest in the committee was at first because of her friendship and admiration for Jessica, and through the years to some extent her interest was transferred to me. The University recognized this somewhat personal relationship and realized that she might no longer make her donation, which was never guaranteed, if a new person whom she did not know was made chairman.

King: How did you feel about continuing as chairman of the Heller Committee?

EHH: I of course cannot judge whether or not this was the best decision, but it was a stroke of luck for me to have a small research staff with which I could work closely on projects which interested me greatly. For some time I carried a full teaching load, but in later years my teaching was reduced by one course, which allowed more time for research.

King: Were the Heller Committee's income and expenditure studies your source materials for your course in the economics of consumption?

EHH: These and other studies of course provided valuable illustrations of consumption patterns, but particularly in the 1940's and 1950's economists began to recognize the importance of consumption, not only for the individual or family, but for the economy as a whole.

Books and articles were appearing, with new and varied theories as to the impact on the economy of consumer spending, consumer debt and saving. New facts and analyses in the field of consumption resulted in a course quite different from earlier courses in the field which were largely limited to family budgeting.

King: Have you mentioned all the fields in which you taught?

EHH: No. I also taught a graduate course in the methods of social research. There were courses in statistics, but my colleagues and I felt that many of our students needed some training in the practical use of statistical techniques, particularly in the field of social problems.

All of the students had taken a course in statistics, and my chief job was to give them training and experience in the use of statistical and other research techniques. Time did not allow for gathering data in the field, but I was able to arrange with a number of small agencies in the area to use raw materials in their files.

A teaching assistant worked with the students in the agencies, and I guided them in the seminar and in individual conferences. Of course there were problems, but the agencies appreciated these small studies. Some of course were well done, and others not so good.

This course was only one semester, too short a time, but it is at least gratifying when I now see former students to have them express appreciation of even the little they learned.

King: Your life at the University certainly included much more than teaching, and perhaps some problems. Would you say something about this?

EHH: You are quite right. The life of a University professor is not limited to teaching. It is believed, and I think correctly, that promotions all too frequently give little importance to teaching ability. Perhaps the best way to illustrate the non-teaching activities is to use the classifications considered by promotion

EHH: committees' research, community service, and University service.

King: Could you discuss each of these briefly?

Research [The Heller Committee]

EHH: Yes, I will be glad to and would like first to add something to what I have already said regarding my Heller Committee research. In addition to studies of incomes and expenditures on samples of certain occupational groups, wage earners and white collar workers, we developed budgets which could be priced annually.

The source materials for the goods and services included in these budgets were income and expenditure studies, which of course showed great differences in the way people spend their money. A so-called "standard" budget is not a photographic reproduction of spending patterns but rather an attempt to measure "commonly accepted standards of living," not what the researcher thinks a particular group "ought to have."

There are few objective standards of what should and should not be included in these budgets. For example, a nutritionist can determine the quantities of various food necessary for adequate nutrition, but unless food habits are taken into account, the food budget will be completely unrealistic. For most items there are no objective standards. So the question is what should be included and what quantities.

Our method was, using income and expenditure studies as a guide as well as other available information, to include in the budgets the items purchased by over 50 per cent of the families studied. This method of course requires revisions in the items to be included from time to time.

For example, the wage earner budget did not include an automobile for many years, and a television was added much later, when these items had clearly become part of the customary expenditure patterns of families in this occupational group. Expenditure patterns do not change rapidly, and thus a standard budget need not be changed when only a few have automobiles, etc.

The budgets were sometimes subject to criticism, because it was thought that revisions came "too soon" or "too late." I doubt that changes were made "too soon," but because of the difficulty of getting up-to-date information there may have been some lag in revisions.

EHH: When the items to be included had been decided, the budgets were priced annually in stores where the families customarily made their purchases, and average prices were used in the computations. The published budgets showed both quantities and cost each year. When there were changes in the items included, the differences in the total cost between an earlier and later year did not measure a change in the "cost of living," but at least in part a change in the customary standard of living.

The Heller Committee published standard budgets each year, with a few exceptions for revision, from 1923 to 1960. In the early years, budgets were priced for the family of an executive, wage earner and white collar worker.

In 1931, at the request of Miss Katherine Felton, executive of the Children's Agency in San Francisco, a dependency budget was published to be used as a guide for relief allowances. And in 1939, when a revision of the minimum wage for women was under consideration, a budget for single working women was priced.

These three budgets were last priced in 1949, and for the next two years all the budgets were being revised. The executive budget was dropped, because too little data were available for revision. The budget for dependent families and a single working woman were also discontinued in conformity with our policy to discontinue a budget if the work had been taken over by another responsible organization.

The State Department of Social Welfare, using our dependency budget as a guideline, began to price a similar budget in all counties and the California Division of Labor Statistics and Research a budget similar to ours for the single working woman. After important revisions, the Heller Budgets for a wage earner and white collar worker were continued to 1960.

The Heller Budgets were used widely throughout the United States. For many years these were the only budgets of their kind. Summaries were published in many books on the economics of consumption. They were used in labor negotiations by both labor and employer and in articles in both labor and employer journals, and in state and federal publications.

Not all who used our materials were satisfied with what they found. Employers frequently complained that the budgets were too high and labor that they were too low, but the integrity of our results was never questioned as far as I know, and I am quite certain that I would have known.

The research done under the auspices of the Heller Committee was not limited to the field of costs and standards of living.

EHH: I was fortunate to be allowed assistance from the staff of the Committee for research in fields of special interest to me. For example, "The Cost of Medical Care," a study of 455 families in the Bay Area, "Doors to Jobs," a study of the organization of the labor market in California, financed in part by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, and "Unemployment Relief and the Unemployed in the San Francisco Bay Region."

In addition, I had assistance in preparing speeches and articles on unemployment and health insurance and related problems. Much of my "free" time was of course spent on our annual publications, and without assistance from the Heller Committee it would have been difficult if not impossible to carry on other research activities.

Because the work of the Heller Committee was so well known, I had the very interesting opportunity to serve on Committees of the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, in 1941-1942 and again in 1948. I was given brief leaves to work on this project in Berkeley and in Washington.

A city worker's budget was to be set up to be priced in a number of cities throughout the United States. The Heller Budget was used as a starting point and frame of reference. The budget which was finally adopted was similar in purpose and general methodology to ours.

The expert Washington staff, particularly Mrs. Dorothy Brady, a highly competent statistician whom I had known for many years, suggested some techniques which were an improvement. In spite of possibly being accused of bias, I think that the long years of our work in Berkeley served as a basic background for the Bureau of Labor Statistics City Worker's Budget, with appropriate variations for pricing in many cities.

King: You said that you retired in 1961. I believe this was two years prior to the time you would have been forced to retire by University regulations. Why did you retire early, and what happened to the Heller Committee?

EHH: Yes, I retired at the age of 65, two years earlier than required by University rules. I had some misgivings as to my decision, and many of my colleagues urged me not to. They said, "Why substitute a dreary and dull life for one which you enjoy?"

But my decision was made, and I didn't change my mind. Not just to be stubborn, but I really felt that in spite of good health and plenty of energy I simply could not nor did I want to become a mathematically oriented economist, and that was the vogue--good or bad I won't try to guess. I never regretted this decision.

EHH: The Heller Committee came to an end shortly after my retirement. Of course I was disappointed and somewhat surprised. Mrs. Heller died in August, 1959, but she had said many times, "Ed (her son) is proud of the work of the Heller Committee, and he will continue our annual donation at my death." This he did until his death in December, 1961.

I, of course, hoped and even expected that his wife Eleanor, whom I had known for many years, would also continue this support. But this she did not do, and as I recall the money which always came in monthly checks was cut off, I believe with the December check or possibly a month or so later. The University continued its support to the close of that academic year--at least to allow time for an office clean-up job--then no more.

King: Have you any idea why this happened with apparently no warning?

EHH: I cannot answer this with any certainty. During my last year I attempted to have a new chairman appointed, and even made a few suggestions, but it didn't happen. It may have been difficult to find a person with time and interest. There was a fine young man who would have been interested, but he did not have tenure and was not reappointed.

I had a feeling, but no conclusive evidence, that some other research organization was competing for our funds from the University.

Probably I was at fault in not pushing harder and seeing the "right" people in the University, and I felt this keenly when the blow came. At this late date I must have said, "There is nothing more I can do." And with the interest of everyone in the economics department so far afield, I just gave up.

I am not justifying my action, but it may have been at least in part that my dear friend with whom I had lived for thirty years was very ill--and died a few months later.

As I have already mentioned, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics had started pricing a Wage Earner Budget, and at least this important part of the work of the Heller Committee made a contribution to the federal project.

Hopefully, federal funds will be available to price yearly this new Wage Earner Budget and for revisions at reasonable intervals. However, I still wonder whether any University research organization will concern itself with social problems, which cannot always be turned into mathematical symbols.

University Service

King: You have said that members of the faculty are expected to give some service to the University in addition to teaching. How did you meet this responsibility?

EHH: As you probably know there are a large number of committees of the faculty appointed by the Academic Senate to provide information to the Senate and often to recommend action. A few faculty members, I am sure the number is small, seem to like nothing better than to have committee appointments.

The vast majority feel quite differently. Some are quite reluctant to serve, but I think most are willing to accept a reasonable amount of this kind of service. From time to time there were suggestions that all committees be abolished.

My response to this always was, "The only thing worse than too many committees would be no committees." A policy of no committees would mean that the policies and actions would to a large extent be determined by a few individuals. The faculty would have abrogated their responsibility and right to participate throughout the process of making decisions.

I always felt that service on these committees was a duty, although my preference was as few as possible. I was seldom overburdened. I was usually requested to serve on one or two, occasionally more, committees each year. In some cases I thought that the problem could have been handled without taking faculty time, but usually I felt that it was important for a small committee to gather and analyze information and make recommendations to the Senate.

One illustration was the Committee on Faculty Welfare, of which I was chairman. The problem was whether or not the faculty should be covered by the Social Security Act as part of the University Retirement System. We worked long hours and presented a careful report considering both the theoretical and practical problems involved.

The Committee recommended that the faculty be covered by Social Security. As I remember, the vote of a large majority of the faculty as a whole was yes on our recommendation. However the Regents refused to do this. Perhaps our work might be considered a waste of time, but this did not appear to be the attitude of the faculty.

There were, of course, many other types of University service. I shall mention two which I performed on request. For

EHH: several years I was one of the elected members of the Representative Assembly which was in existence at that time. It was later abolished but I believe may be reestablished. And for several years I was vice-chairman of the economics department under the chairmanship of Andreas Papandreou.

I remember vividly the day Andy came to my study and said, "I have been appointed Chairman of the department, and wish to recommend your appointment as vice chairman. Will you do this? I need your help as a long-time member of the department. I haven't been long in Berkeley."

I think Andy was fearful that I would not want to work under a much younger person. However that was no problem to me, and I had no desire to assume the administrative problems of a Chairman. We made satisfactory arrangements as to the division of responsibility, and we always worked together well. It was an interesting experience, but it did interfere some with my teaching, and I was glad not to have to continue as vice chairman for a longer period.

There were, of course, a number of other kinds of University service, but I think the illustrations I have given are sufficient to indicate that although sometimes a burden, one gains insight into many problems not only of the faculty but of the University administrator.

Community Service

King: What were some of the activities which you have characterized as community service?

EHH: It is not possible to draw a hard and fast line between each of the activities of a University professor. For example, at least hopefully, most of our activities are not of significance only within or only outside the University community. For example, our teaching or research may bring calls from governmental or non-governmental organizations for information, advice, or membership on committees or commissions.

Of course, the professor may be paid for these services, but my feeling was that a paid job usually required too much time to be taken from teaching. I did do some work outside the University for which I was paid, but I took a leave from the University on these occasions.

I think that most faculty members feel a responsibility for

EHH: some service to the general community. It is probable that requests for assistance come most frequently to the faculties in the social sciences, but they may also come to professors in many other fields.

King: Could you describe briefly some of your own community service activities?

EHH: There was seldom a week in which I did not receive some request. To some my answer had to be no in terms of my knowledge and time available, and to others I could say yes.

The two subjects to which I gave most of my available time were costs and standards of living and social insurance--most frequently unemployment and health insurance.

Costs and Standards of Living

In the field of costs and standards of living, I served as:

Adviser to the staff of the State Department of Social Welfare when they were setting up budgets for families and dependent children suitable for pricing throughout the state.

Member of the State Department of Social Welfare Committee to make recommendations for a budget for a single working woman.

Member of the Industrial Welfare Commission of the State of California from 1942-1945, when the minimum wage for women was being revised.

During this period (1942-1945) I also attended and testified at public hearings. The minimum wage was increased from 35 cents to 50 cents per hour--I think this was in late 1942 or early 1943--hardly a generous sum even then.

Of course labor representatives objected to such a low minimum, and many employers said, "This will put us out of business." We doubted that this would happen often, and when it did it was usually an inefficient employer. It was the responsibility of the Industrial Welfare Commission to determine a reasonable minimum wage to be required of all employers, and the rate of 50 cents an hour adopted by the commission was still below what several commission members considered to be adequate for even a bare minimum.

EHH: A few years ago when Governor Brown appointed a Consumer Counsel as a member of his staff in Sacramento, I was appointed a member of the Advisory Committee to the Consumer Counsel. We had monthly meetings in Sacramento, and members of the committee were responsible for reports on a wide variety of consumer problems, including, of course, prices and the cost of living.

Many times I was requested to speak at meetings of employer and labor groups to discuss the techniques of measuring costs and standards of living, and the purposes for which these data were appropriate. Many questions came asking for information which was at the time not available.

For example, the telephone company and others asked, "What is the difference in the cost of living in New York and San Francisco?" My answer was, "I can't answer this and no one can." It was hard for them to believe this, and it often required a long letter or telephone call to convince them.

Social Insurance

King: Will you tell me something of your public service or work in the field of social insurance?

EHH: As I have said, my interest in social insurance goes back many years, to a course I had as an undergraduate, to my year in England, and then to my University teaching. Soon after I settled into teaching and had started on my research with the Heller Committee, things began to happen in social insurance legislation: the Social Security Act in 1935, unemployment insurance legislation at about the same time, and a rapidly increasing interest in health insurance.

I, of course, kept up with these developments as essential to my teaching and soon found that I was called upon for information on these subjects by various concerned groups, by legislators and others. I soon found that most of my time available for public service was used in this field. This continued for most of my years at the University. Of course my own interests were also satisfied by these "calls for help."

King: Could you give me some illustrations of what you did in the various fields of social insurance?

EHH: Yes. I will first mention old age insurance, where my interest was of course great. However, my efforts were largely concentrated on unemployment insurance and even more on health insurance.

Old Age Insurance

EHH: In the 1930's, at long last, the United States began to recognize that only social insurance could protect workers against many of the hazards which strike large numbers. We had lagged far behind most of the industrialized countries in this.

Responsibility for the Social Security Act of 1935 rests largely on the doorstep of President Franklin Roosevelt. In 1934 he appointed a Committee on Economic Security to report a program to Congress in 1935. Out of this flowed the Social Security Act of August 14, 1935, which included a federal old age insurance law, and an attempt to stimulate state unemployment insurance laws. I will comment on this section of the law later.

One of the chief "architects" of the old age insurance part of this law was my friend and colleague, Professor Barbara Armstrong. Except as a student of what was going on, I took no part in the original act. Barbara had far greater competence than I in this field, and in addition she and I always agreed on the principles of this legislation.

There was considerable opposition to the proposals which were being made, and long arguments on details. Mrs. Armstrong and others fought for months for a law which would give reasonably adequate protection. Finally the fight was won, and the act included federal comprehensive compulsory old age insurance, and many very important provisions which Mrs. Armstrong had defended.

Mrs. Armstrong was often the person responsible for preventing opponents from destroying the effectiveness of the law. Of course there were disappointments, particularly that health insurance was not included. Barbara had often said, "The act was far from perfect, but I did the best I could." And to me this was a very good "best."

The Social Security Act has been amended many times since 1935. Particularly important was the extension to include survivors and disabled persons. During this period I frequently worked with the staff of the Social Security Administration in this region, sent memoranda to members of Congress with suggestions, etc. However, this required little of my time.

King: Didn't you also do some work in the field of unemployment insurance?

EHH: Yes, and I will be glad to tell you about it.

Unemployment Insurance

EHH: Within a brief time after the Social Security Act was passed, all states had adopted unemployment insurance laws. At this time there was no doubt that an unemployment insurance law would be passed in California because the Social Security Act of 1935 required employers in any state without an unemployment insurance law to pay a tax to the federal government.

The tax would start at 1 per cent of payroll in 1935 and increase to 3 per cent of payroll in 1938. But in states with unemployment insurance laws, there was a rebate of 90 per cent of the tax. Thus the incentive to pass an unemployment insurance law was very strong.

When a California bill was before our legislature in 1935, I often conferred with legislators, labor groups, and others. And I frequently went to Sacramento to testify at legislative hearings. I was, of course, concerned with who was protected, what were the benefits, how long the worker had to be employed before receiving benefits, and how it was to be financed and administered.

I often restricted my limited time allowed at a hearing to one or two points. For example, who was to be protected. The bill as passed was restricted to workers employed by employers of eight or more. Why should not those who happened to be employed by a smaller employer be covered? I argued this point, with no results. But the law was amended several years later to include employers of one or more.

Another question I frequently discussed was whether the worker should contribute or only the employer. My feeling was that the worker should contribute. I may be wrong, but I think that workers should pay direct contributions, at least a small amount, to all forms of social insurance.

This is a protection to the worker. If he pays into it he will have a greater feeling of security as to his rights to the benefits, and hopefully more concern about its financing and administration.

Long ago I was convinced of the desirability of a worker's contribution by Sir William Beveridge, who many times has said, "British workers want to contribute to all the social insurances. They feel that this gives them more certainty that they will receive benefits."

This question was argued many times by the legislative

EHH: committee, and the act as passed included a worker contribution. It was, however, abolished in 1946 and transferred to a cash disability fund--a good provision, but I still think there should be a worker contribution to unemployment insurance.

Another problem on which I had strong feelings was what is called "experience rating." This permits an employer with a small amount of unemployment in his plant to pay a smaller contribution than an employer with a high unemployment rate. The theory of this is that it will be a stimulus to prevent unemployment. But unemployment is largely beyond the control of an individual employer, so this provision gives an advantage to the "lucky" employer whose workers have little unemployment.

Under a social insurance law, the risk should be distributed over all employers, which will provide an adequate fund to pay benefits to workers in high unemployment industries. Furthermore, variations in rate of contribution in terms of amount of unemployment will result in larger employer contributions in times of depression when they can least afford it and lower rates in periods of prosperity.

The idea of experience rating seems to be very attractive to employers, and it was included in the California act. The efforts of others as well as myself were without success. The California law as passed was a reasonably good law. It has been amended many times and usually improved.

After this law was passed, although my interest in unemployment insurance did not wane in the years that followed, I concentrated most of my attention on health insurance, hoping that California might be willing to pass a health insurance bill--to meet a need of the greatest possible importance.

Health Insurance

For many years, study after study had clearly shown the plight of all our population when illness strikes. Lacking insurance, only the few with very high incomes could, without great hardship, pay their own medical bills.

In the period from 1913 to 1920, a number of states were stirred into action on the plight of the ill. California and seven other states appointed commissions to study the sickness problem and make recommendations. Mrs. Armstrong was Executive Secretary of the California Social Insurance Commission, 1917-1919. California and five other states recommended compulsory health insurance.

EHH: During this period there was an avalanche of propaganda, and although health insurance bills were introduced in a number of states, no state was able to overcome the adverse propaganda against health insurance.

Even before I returned to Berkeley in 1929, I had a special interest in health insurance, probably in part because my father was a physician and professor of surgery at the University of California Medical School. As a young person at home I often heard of the plight of low income people at the University and county hospitals.

Others were seen in the physician's office but could afford to pay him only a small part of his usual charge, or even nothing. They had to depend on reduced fees by physicians who were dedicated to their responsibility to provide health care. My father was one of these, and I often heard him discuss the economic distress and even humiliation of patients who had to request care for which they could pay little or nothing.

Frequently it was a case of a very sick child of a family with a meager income sent to my father by a physician from towns where physicians with the necessary skills were not available. I vividly remember several such cases, one a child suffering from cancer and another with a facial defect requiring plastic surgery.

At that time specialties had not developed as they now have. My father was a general surgeon but apparently had considerable skill in plastic surgery. I remember how proud he was that he had been able to "make a new nose" for a little girl. He took me to visit her. Of course her nose was not perfect, but her face was no longer grotesque, and I remember thinking that she was an attractive looking child.

Both of these cases and of course many others were private cases whose families could pay nothing for their care. Of course others could pay something. Many and perhaps most physicians took care of patients who could not pay. This could create a serious problem for physicians without otherwise lucrative practices. In addition, the patient was frequently a person whose income was sufficient for his usual needs, who now had to ask for "charity" to pay medical bills far beyond his ability to meet.

My interest in health insurance was also stimulated during my year in England in 1920. England had had a very limited health insurance law since 1911. While I was in London I had an opportunity not only to study a large number of public documents and other source materials but also to discuss the operations of the system with many of the people I met.

EHH: The best evidence of course came from large scale studies based on interviews with people covered under the system. There were a few who were dissatisfied mainly because the system was limited in coverage. But the almost universal consensus can best be illustrated by a few quotations from people who were covered by the law:

"You can't imagine what it has done for us."

"It has relieved us of enormous burdens."

"Although we still have a good many health bills to pay, it helps. But it should be changed to include everyone."

As you can see, my interest in health insurance was keen when I returned to Berkeley in 1929, and it was further stimulated by my teaching. I soon renewed my friendship with Barbara Armstrong, who was then working on her book, Insuring the Essentials.

She generously shared her knowledge with me, and perhaps I can say we joined forces in our mutual determination to work toward insuring against the risk of illness through legislation. We determined not just to get some law on the statute books, but a good law which would truly provide protection.

At about this time, nearly 20 years after the last attempt to convince the legislature that a health insurance law was an absolute necessity, public concern again came to the forefront. And I decided that I wanted to give as much as possible of my time available for public service to helping those with a real desire that California should adopt a good health insurance act, not some meager or faulty piece of legislation which would carry the title of "health insurance."

King: What kinds of things did you do to support the passage of a health insurance law? Could you give me some illustrations?

EHH: I will start by giving you a general picture of the kinds of things I did, usually on request, but sometimes on my own, often with a self-appointed committee. The requests came from a variety of persons and organizations; for example, the League of Women Voters, the Democratic State Central Committee, the Young Democrats, a Governor's Committee on Health Insurance, the Advisory Committee to the Consumer Counsel of California, the San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Public Health Section of the Commonwealth Club.

I also many times appeared at public hearings of committees of the legislature and conferred with legislators. I prepared analyses of the many health insurance bills in the legislature

EHH: from 1935 on. I find in my files well over a dozen formal memoranda or speeches, many of which required long hours of preparation. However, this does not tell the whole story. Many times I took part in meetings and discussions and kept no file of the brief notes I may have used to jog my memory.

Perhaps the most important jobs to be done were in connection with bills proposed to the legislature by a variety of persons with very different points of view. In March of 1935, the House of Delegates of the California Medical Association passed a resolution appointing a committee of six of its members to prepare legislation providing a health insurance system and to work with senators to make arrangements for its introduction in the Senate.

This was done on April 12th. This bill, while expressing a belief in "health insurance," was at least a step away from their long-time fight against any such proposal. It was a bill to provide voluntary insurance with insurance companies as the carrier.

By this time it had been recognized by those who were knowledgeable and really concerned that voluntary membership would never reach those who need it most, and that rates which must be charged by commercial companies are far too high for a large portion of the population.

It didn't seem that this bill had the slightest chance of passing. As I recall, Mrs. Armstrong and I saw a few legislators, most of whom seemed to be aware that this bill was without merit. As far as I know, nothing more was heard of it after the 1935 legislative session.

By 1938, the California Medical Association adopted a new approach--no legislation, but a voluntary plan administered by a non-profit association--the California Physicians Service. This proposal, again, while making it less expensive than a commercial insurance company, did not include compulsory coverage, which has long proven to be the only way to be certain that all--or at least all who need the protection, and this includes a vast majority of the population--will actually be insured against the cost of sickness.

Concern for the economic plight of the sick was now mounting, and there was evidence that new legislation would soon be proposed. In about mid-1938, a group of faculty at the University of California decided to hold a series of meetings and at least prepare a statement of the principles which are an absolute must for a health insurance law.

There were 8 members of this self-appointed group. You might ask, 'How were the members chosen?' As I recall, I had found that

EHH: several of my colleagues in and outside the department of economics had become interested in the possibility of health insurance, and perhaps I started the ball rolling. Probably some were suggested by Professor Penrose, then in the economics department, and of course Mrs. Armstrong, who suggested Professor Kidd of the Law School.

Also represented were the departments of political science, public health, statistics, and surprisingly the physicist Robert Oppenheimer was a member. I have no idea how he happened to join our group, but we were lucky to have his sharp mind and his enthusiastic interest in our project.

We had weekly meetings for several months, and by the end of 1938 we had prepared an eleven page statement, "General Principles of a Health Insurance Law." We did not have funds for broad distribution, but we tried to make this document available to legislators and others who might be responsible for legislation. Professor Penrose, Mrs. Armstrong and I found this completely unofficial document useful in the years following, when all sorts of bills were being proposed to legislators.

Early in 1939, Governor Olsen was considering submitting a health insurance bill to the legislature. It appeared probably that the Medical Association would again propose a bill including "absolutely essential" features. Apparently the Governor was aware that most of what the C. M. A. characterized as "essential" had already been conclusively disproved by the unanimous experience of health insurance throughout the world. Chester Rowell, writing in the San Francisco Chronicle, December 22, 1938, pointed this out in his usual vivid language.

Governor Olsen appointed a subcommittee of the California Research Committee on Labor Problems requesting a report and recommendations on health insurance legislation. The membership of this Committee included: Mrs. Armstrong, myself; Dr. Thomas Addis, a San Francisco physician and a man who was knowledgeable and recognized the dangers of the Medical Association's point of view; Herman Stuyvelaar, C.I.O.; E. A. McMillan of the Railroad Workers; Daniel Murphy, A.F.L.

We held many meetings, all in San Francisco. There were no fundamental differences as to general principles but of course differences of opinion on many details. Throughout we maintained respect for each other and finally agreed on a draft which was submitted to Governor Olsen.

The essential principles included in our recommendation were: a health insurance system must be compulsory, all wage earners covered; benefits in hospital, home and doctor's office;

EHH: contributions from worker, employer and government; free choice of physician; health insurance funds administered by a state agency, not by a private insurance company.

King: What happened to your report?

EHH: Governor Olsen sponsored a bill submitted to the legislature which included the recommendations of the committee (AB 2172). During the many weeks, and it may have been months, Mrs. Armstrong and I, sometimes taking turns, spent many hours at legislative hearings--a long drive up and back in between our teaching schedules.

We never were certain whether or not we would be asked to testify. Sometimes the committee members just listened to what we had to say and asked us questions. On other occasions we were confronted with "the opposition," usually some member of the medical profession or an insurance company representative. This was an interesting experience, but it all came to naught. My memory is that the bill never got out of committee.

King: What happened after the Olsen bill was turned down?

EHH: The next real surge in the direction of health insurance came from 1945 to 1949. Again the goals were not reached.

One of Earl Warren's first acts on being inaugurated as Governor of California in 1945 was to sponsor a compulsory health insurance bill. When this failed to pass he sponsored a somewhat different bill in 1947, and again in 1949. In this same period two bills were sponsored by labor organizations.

Mrs. Armstrong and I kept a sharp eye not only on what was being proposed by each bill, but on what was going on in Sacramento. Sometimes we worked together, or sometimes she would be responsible for testimony at the hearings and I at committees.

King: How did you decide whether to support or to oppose a bill?

EHH: We of course analyzed each bill and were prepared to point out provisions which we thought defective. Our policy was not to suggest minor revisions, section by section, but to concentrate on failures to meet adequate standards for a health insurance law.

1. Was it compulsory?
2. Did it protect a large proportion of the population?
3. Were the benefits available adequate although not necessarily covering every possible medical cost?
4. Was the financing adequate and equitable? We thought

- EHH: that the covered person, his employer and the government should share in the cost. But of course there might be reasonable variations of this.
5. Were the funds from which benefits would be paid administered by a government agency--not by a private insurance company?
 6. What was the method of paying physicians--a fee for each service performed or an annual payment for every person choosing a physician who would be responsible for his health care, so much per capita whether the person covered was sick or well?

The fee for service system has the disadvantage that there is a built-in incentive for more patient visits than are really necessary, and it is impossible to estimate the cost in advance. It has been shown that this system always requires to say the least annoying and certainly expensive supervision of why and how often the doctor treats his patient.

It is perhaps of interest to realize that under the Federal Medicare insurance for the aged it has been necessary in the last months to put brakes on the physician's charges. Only recently a bill from my physician for \$35 was reduced by Medicare to \$25, which was considered to be the proper "customary charge."

With the per capita system the physician is paid an annual fee for each patient who chooses him as his doctor. This stimulates preventive care, and if he doesn't give good care his patient is free to move to another doctor. Although the per capita system is certainly the most satisfactory method of payment, if a law is satisfactory in other respects we should probably say, 'Let the doctors try it.'

King: With these guidelines in mind, which bills did you and Mrs. Armstrong support or oppose?

EHH: I won't try to go into the details of each bill. First I will comment on the three health insurance bills sponsored by Governor Warren from 1945 to 1949. The bills of 1945 and 1947 both limited protection to persons covered by the California Unemployment Insurance law. This left too many without protection, but at least it would have been a start.

The 1945 bill (AB 800) provided reasonably acceptable service for hospitalized and non-hospitalized patients, but the 1947 bill (SB 788) provided benefits only while hospitalized--certainly a downward and unacceptable shift in the adequacy of protection provided. It failed to provide comprehensive medical care.

There was another very important difference between these two proposals. The 1945 bill provided that all funds must be

EHH: deposited in a state health insurance fund, and all payments would be made from this fund. The 1947 act, on the other hand, permitted an employer belonging to a voluntary plan including insurance companies to "contract out" and pay nothing into the state fund.

This will almost inevitably in spite of complex rules and regulations result in high risk employers remaining in the state fund, raising costs. All funds should be pooled so that the risk of a high rate of illness would be distributed over the entire group.

In 1949 a bill (SB 157) was introduced in the legislature. This bill was identical with the 1947 Warren bill. Thus it had the same serious faults. It is difficult to account for Warren's willingness to support such a "watered down" health insurance bill, when in 1945 his bill showed real desire for a health insurance law which would provide truly comprehensive protection.

Perhaps Warren thought that by limiting protection to care in the hospital the opposition of the "doctors's lobby" and the insurance companies might possibly disappear or at least be lessened. If this were the case his expectations were wrong, and there continued to be attempts to appeal to fear of "communism," "socialism," and the freedom of doctors to give care to their patients.

During the legislative sessions of 1945 and 1947 and 1949, Mrs. Armstrong and I testified at many committee hearings, and in our few contacts with Governor Warren we got the impression that what he most wanted was for us to "go away."

This we did not do. Our position was supported by a few of those who testified, often representatives of labor unions. But again the "doctors's lobby" won, and not even the emasculated bills of 1947 and 1949 were passed.

We supported strongly two bills introduced in this period: in 1945 AB 449, and in 1949 AB 863. These bills were submitted with the sponsorship of labor. In some respects these bills were the same or close to the same as the Warren bills of this period. The persons protected were the same, and benefits similar to the Warren bill of 1945.

But these acts both provided benefits in and outside the hospital, whereas in the Warren bills of 1947 and 1949 benefits were restricted to hospitalized illnesses. Furthermore, both of these proposals required all funds to be deposited in a state health insurance fund, whereas the Warren bills of 1947-1949

EHH: permitted "contracting out," that is, health insurance funds could be used to provide insurance through private insurance companies.

Finally only one of these acts, AB 449, 1945, included a specific provision for the payment of physicians. It provided that the physicians shall be paid a per capita sum for each person who chooses him as his physician.

All of the Warren bills, and one of these labor sponsored bills, AB 863, did not specify the basic method of payment of the physician but left the determination to the Health Service Authority.

It is difficult to say why the method of payment of the physician was specified as a per capita sum in the labor sponsored bill of 1945 but was left up to the administrative Authority to decide in 1949. We had thought that labor, with whom we had worked for several years, had accepted the importance of putting into any bill a specific provision as to payment of physicians. Perhaps the drafters of their 1949 bill felt that omitting this important principle would lessen opposition to the bill.

Both Mrs. Armstrong and I at hearings in Sacramento supported these two bills, although making suggestions as to some desirable amendments. However these bills like all the others "went down the drain."

King: You mentioned earlier that there was considerable feeling that health insurance should have been included in the federal Social Security Act of 1935. Was this given any further attention by Congress in the years following 1935?

EHH: Yes. There were many bills introduced in Congress. The National Health Survey of 1935-1936 gave a much needed jolt to Congress, and a long series of bills were considered by the Congress in the next decade. For a few years the bills provided various measures to try to stimulate states to pass health insurance legislation, but beginning in 1945 a number of bills providing for National Compulsory Health insurance were considered by Congress.

It was beginning to be recognized by the members of Congress that there was little likelihood that state legislation would be enacted. Furthermore, a federal law, with of course the states having considerable responsibility for administration, was the only way to make certain that the same amounts and kinds of care could be assured to people no matter in which state they happened to live.

None of these bills were passed. The opposing lobbyists, as in California, were always in the halls of Congress, always

EHH: describing in vivid language often with little regard for the truth, the evils of this (to use only one of their phrases) "un-American" way of solving a problem. They often even suggested that the problem really didn't exist.

A break-through finally came in 1965 when health insurance was provided for those over 65, Medicare, by an amendment to the Social Security Act.

King: How did this happen? Had the opposition disappeared?

EHH: The opposition had certainly not disappeared, but a continuous flow of information on the plight of the sick had convinced Congress that protection must be provided. Why just for the aged? What about all the rest of the population? There was evidence that the aged people as a group are likely to have more illness than the younger.

But serious and expensive illness strikes people of all ages, and this is a risk like the risk of your house burning, for which protection can be provided only through the use of the insurance principle of distribution of risk over large groups.

It seems likely that Congress decided that it might be possible to pass a law limited to the aged. The plight of the old person with declining income and so often a completely disabling illness might appeal to the sentiment of all and even to the often distorted logic of the opponents.

The Medicare Act was passed, but not until after hearings lasting many months, with the opponents over and over again attempting to put fear into the members of Congress of the dangers of such a "radical" piece of legislation, often with a final plea, "If this law is passed we may expect it to be just a first step; soon there will be pressure to extend this protection to all of the population."

Medicare has worked amazingly well, although there have of course been many problems. It now looks as though the forecast of the medical profession may have been justified. The President has suggested in 1970 that there may be a need for some form of health insurance for the population as a whole. So far there are no details as to what type of system will be proposed.

This morning (July 8, 1970), the San Francisco Chronicle published another piece of good news for health insurance. A citizens committee of 100 in Washington D.C. had been brought together to develop a "Health Security plan" by Walter Reuther, head of the United Automobile Workers a short time before his death several months ago, and this committee is now under the

EHH: direction of Reuther's successor. Walter Reuther for many years had been a strong supporter of compulsory health insurance.

The plan as outlined today appears to include the principles which are essential for truly comprehensive protection. The recommendations propose a health insurance plan for everyone, rich and poor, to be financed by a three-way contribution--employer, insured person and the government--the funds to be deposited in a Health Security Trust Fund. It would cover care in the hospital, and in a doctor's office, dental care, drugs, and various auxiliary health services.

The article said that Senator Edward Kennedy, a member of the Committee of 100, has stated that a bill to carry out the proposal will be introduced this month and that he hopes it will be enacted within the next year.

The question will immediately arise as to what will be the attitude of the medical profession. The doctors at the news conference refused to comment, but Dr. DeBakey, the well-known heart surgeon, said, "I believe there is an increasing sense, within the medical profession in general, of urgency concerning the health care of all people."

Whether the "sense of urgency" will mean that the A.M.A. will support a compulsory and adequate health insurance bill is of course unknown at this moment. I fear that "compulsion" and many of the other proposals of the Committee of 100 will continue to be anathema to the medical profession and that we can expect months and perhaps even years of all the old arguments and delaying tactics of the A.M.A.

It is my hope that "watch dogs" who want to be certain that any law will insure truly effective protection will be able to prevent the opponents from either defeating any extension of health insurance or succeeding in efforts, which they are sure to make, to get a bill passed which will provide completely inadequate protection.

King: Did you play any part in the consideration by Congress of federal compulsory health insurance legislation?

EHH: I certainly played no major part, since much of my time was taken up with bills before our California legislature. I did prepare analyses of each bill as it was introduced in Congress, and pointed out the good and bad provisions of each bill.

I sent these memoranda to Congress, to many concerned labor leaders and others and often had the assistance of a close friend, Arthur Miller, attorney for the Social Security Administration in

EHH: this area. Mr. Miller had long been interested in social insurance, and as a lawyer he made me aware of a number of defects in bills which otherwise I might have missed.

Because of his position he could not write to Congressmen, but he was willing and anxious to see that Congressmen and others were at least informed as to what proposed bills would actually accomplish. He and I always agreed on the principles involved, and he was of great help to me in preparing memoranda.

Certainly no measurable results came of my efforts, but it was sometimes gratifying to receive a letter from a Congressman in appreciation of a memorandum I had sent him.

King: It seems to me that the public service you have described must have taken much of your time. Did you ever feel that you had to neglect your teaching or other purely University activities?

EHH: I am of course not the person to answer this question with complete objectivity. I was, however, always very much aware of the danger. I was always careful to have what seemed to me sufficient time for keeping my teaching materials up-to-date. And I always kept regular office hours and time for special appointments with students.

I may have reduced somewhat other types of University service, but as far as I can remember I never refused an appointment on a faculty committee unless I felt that the problem was not within my area of competence or that the job of the committee was one of little importance.

Possibly a class taught just after a long evening meeting and a trip to Sacramento may have been somewhat below the standard I had set for myself. This is said in retrospect, but at the time I don't recall having concern any greater than on occasional other days when I said to myself, "What is wrong? I haven't done a very good job today."

VII THE WAGE STABILIZATION DIVISION OF THE WAR LABOR BOARD

King: During the Second World War, you took leave from the University and went to work for the War Labor Board in San Francisco. Is that right?

EHH: Yes. After Pearl Harbor, the students at the University became smaller in number, and not only that, they were restless. We never knew, each day when we went to class, whether there would be any male students there. They had not all been called yet, but they were naturally rushing around to their draft boards, and they were concerned about whether they were going to have to go and how soon.

Suddenly a student would come and say, "I'm called as of next week." The University was in a state of disturbance--very great disturbance. And, I came to a feeling quite soon, that I could be spared from the University. And, I suppose, I had sort of a feeling that maybe I could do something more with respect to the war effort.

In any case, I thought to myself, "What could I do for which I have some capacity, training and interest?" I talked to a number of people about this. Among others, to my friend Vera Christie who was head of what was then called the Bureau of Occupations at the University.

I said to Vera, "If anything comes to your attention which you think falls within my capacities, please let me know; I don't care what it is. I'm not concerned about how much the salary is or whether the job has kudos or anything of that sort. I just would like to get out and do something that I can't do here at the University."

The next thing I heard was that Clark Kerr, who had been made Wage Stabilization Director of the Tenth Regional War Labor Board in San Francisco, was looking for people to work in his organization. He had sent one of his assistants to the University to have a look around to see who might be available for their staff.

King: Was Clark Kerr on the faculty at this point? Or was he still a labor mediator at the time?

EHH: No, he was not on the faculty. I think he was doing labor arbitration and mediation.

King: He was with the Federal Mediation Service.

EHH: I believe that is correct.

Because of my interests and training as an economist, my name was suggested to Vera Christie, probably by some member of the faculty with some information about my work at the University and the fact that I had always been interested in labor problems. In a week or so Vera said to me, "Emily, I have heard of a job over in San Francisco. Clark Kerr is looking for economists for his staff in the Wage Stabilization Division. I thought of you in connection with this. You might be interested."

"However, I have refused to give your name at the moment to the man I talked to. I wanted to talk it over with you first. He suggested that, as a woman, you would be paid less than a man." Vera told me her reply to this. "In these circumstances I will not suggest anybody. I have a woman in mind, but I am not going to suggest her name."

She said to me, "Would you be interested in the job?" I said, "Yes, it sounds interesting. However I don't intend to go over there and be paid a wage lower than that of a man doing the same work."

I don't believe that the suggestion of lower pay to a woman ever came from Kerr. In any case, after hearing from his scout that I might be available, and possibly getting information about me from some of my colleagues, word came to me from Kerr requesting me to see him. This I did immediately.

He asked me to take a job as head of one of the units of the Wage Stabilization Division at the rate paid to all in this job classification. I accepted, was granted a leave by the University, and went to work in February, 1943.

The work of the Wage Stabilization Division was divided into units: one unit dealt with manufacturing, one with retail trade, one with the canning industry, and the one I was working in at first was called "Service and White Collar Occupations."

One of the first cases I ever had to deal with was a motion picture case. The motion picture industry was very much concerned because they wanted to employ some skilled horseback riders at a

EHH: rate far above the usual pay for these jobs. There was a great shortage of labor supply, and they wanted to pay them some phenomenal sum to try to attract people from other jobs.

Although I had only been at my desk a few days, I knew that this was not permitted. Before submitting my recommendation of denial, I discussed the case with the Assistant Wage Stabilization Director just in case I might have overlooked some special rule for the powerful motion picture industry. But there was no such exception.

It took me some time of course to become familiar with all the principles that were involved in our decisions, but it soon became relatively easy in most cases to know the rules which must be followed if wages were to be prevented from skyrocketing.

After I had been with the Wage Stabilization Division about five or six months, Clark Kerr left. Lloyd Fisher became the Director and I was appointed assistant director. A few months later Lloyd Fisher left, and at this time what appeared to be sex discrimination raised its head.

There is a general rule in government organizations such as this that when there is an opening, anyone in the organization can put his name on the list to be considered for the position. Since I had been assistant director, it seemed to me that I could be considered for Wage Stabilization Director. I put my name on the list, as did several others.

Immediate action was required because the Director of Wage Stabilization had been given authority to sign and send out all decisions, with a few minor exceptions, and with the proviso that any of these decisions could be appealed to the Wage Stabilization Board, which included an equal number of representatives of employers and labor and the public.

Within a few days I was made Acting Director. Shortly after that the chairman of the War Labor Board, Tom Neblett, came to see me. He said, "We've made you Acting Director, but we don't really feel you can handle the job of Director." I said, "Why not?" He said, "Well, as a woman you wouldn't be able to cope with tough employers and labor representatives."

I thought about it for a minute and I said, "Mr. Neblett, remember we are at war, and that the supply of people available is very short. In my opinion, even though it may be a biased opinion, if you tried to get a person from the small number who are available, I doubt that you could find anyone who would have the experience and competence that I have. Therefore, I think I can do it."

King: (Laughter) I'm going to send you an invitation to join Women's Liberation!

EHH: (Laughing) Well, he said, "I'm not so sure. I don't think you could handle this." I said, "That's not for me to decide. But I have given you my opinion. And remember, there are few people available who know anything about the administration of Wage Stabilization."

There was one man in our organization who was thoroughly fine and competent. However, I had more experience than he, and I had done the job of Assistant Wage Stabilization Director. Even when comparing myself with him, I felt I would be better able to take it over quickly and keep the work flowing freely.

This went on for weeks and weeks and weeks, and I continued as Acting Wage Stabilization Director. I wasn't greatly concerned, except that the burden of work was very heavy and an assistant director had not been appointed. Finally, after several weeks (a month or so, perhaps) suddenly one morning I went into the office and found a note saying that I was appointed Wage Stabilization Director.

This meant that an assistant could be appointed. To my great delight, Paul L. Kleinsorge was given this appointment. He was the man I already mentioned as qualified for Director. He apparently had no feeling against working under a woman. He was competent, his judgment excellent, and we found it easy to divide the work between us. To me it was a joy to work with Paul, and I can only hope that he felt as I did that our cooperation was mutually satisfactory.

I would like to mention one small incident which goes back to Tom Neblett's fear that I couldn't be tough. A short time after I had become Director, a very pleasant gentleman from some small industry up in Amador County came to my office.

I said to him, "What is your problem?" And he said, "I'm in awful troubles. A member of my managerial staff raised the wages of a group of employees and they have been paid these wages for months. I didn't know it and he had no right to do it. What am I going to do? We have violated the wage stabilization law."

I said to him, "You say that this has happened without your knowledge." (I was sure he was an honest man, and he was terribly disturbed.) Seeing his great concern, I said, "Don't worry too much about this. Honest minor mistakes are not penalized, if the wrong is corrected. I will ask one of our lawyers to come here from his office upstairs, and he will discuss your problems with you." The mere term lawyer apparently made him think of a court-

EHH: room, possibly jail and a ruined reputation.

I made the call to our legal department, and when I put the telephone down the man was standing in the window. He had his handkerchief out and I could see he was having troubles. I didn't say anything to him. I just stepped out of the office for a minute.

I went into Paul Kleinsorge's office next to mine, and I said to Paul, "If you broke down in front of a person, would you rather it was a man or a woman?" And Paul said, "I think I would rather have a man there." So I said, "All right. Would you talk to a man in my office?" I told him what had happened. And I said, "There is, I believe, no serious problem, but the poor man is in a terrible state."

A few minutes later I took the attorney into the office. He explained that since this was a minor infraction without intent, the wages could again be set at the old rate and there would be no penalty. The man left with the burden of possible dishonesty lifted.

The next morning I met Tom Neblett in the hall. I said to him, "Just in case you think I'm not tough, I made a man cry yesterday." (Laughter) That was kind of a sad little case because the man was not trying to do anything wrong. He was just all confused about the whole matter.

King: Is that typical of the kind of cases that turned up?

EHH: There were a few of the sort I described. But in the main the employers were well aware of the law but hoped to find a loophole which would permit wage increases. And of course a few flauntingly violated the law. These were referred immediately to the legal department and were required to come into compliance or a fine would be imposed.

Perhaps I should explain briefly that although the title of the law under which we were operating was Wage Stabilization, a part of a program to control the inflationary pressures of a war economy, wages were not frozen. There were several situations where wage increases within specified limits could be approved.

If a firm at the time this law was passed was paying a wage less than the "customary" rate for similar jobs in the industry, an increase could be approved. The determination of this rate involved careful research. In general, if a wage rate was below that paid by 50 per cent of the employers, it could be raised to the lowest rate paid by the upper half of the employers. Employers were, of course, not happy when they were told that they could not

EHH: raise wage rates to the highest rate paid by any employer, who may when wage stabilization was imminent have "beaten the gun" and raised wages.

A second type of approvable wage increase was one to correct inequities within a plant or between plants. For example, if there had always been a ten cent an hour differential between the rates of workers in various classifications, and an increase of ten cents an hour had been approved for the workers with the lowest skill, a request would be made to increase all wages ten cents an hour "to prevent inequities."

There were also requests for increases because other plants paid more and the lower paying employer was in difficulty in getting workers. If it was found that the employer requesting this type of increase had customarily paid less than his competitors, the request was denied, and this was often true.

There were, however, a few which could be approved. This was the employer who had usually paid the wage of his competitors, but for a brief period prior to wage stabilization his wage scale had dropped below his competitors.

These two kinds of "inequity" cases were very difficult to administer, and for a few months they threatened the whole principle of putting brakes on wage spiralling. It was just too easy to claim "inequity." Washington however, after several months, issued new and strict guidelines, and after that very few of these cases were approved.

There were two other kinds of increases which could be approved: to raise wages to a legal minimum and to increase wages for the "effective prosecution of the war."

Employers who were paying less than the 50 cents an hour state minimum wage for women, or less than the minimum of 40 cents an hour required by the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act were permitted to raise the wage to these rates. These two provisions were of little importance since California always had been a high wage state. Thus even employers not covered by these acts were usually already paying wages above these minima.

We did, however, have many requests for approval of rates above the California minimum for women. I will give you one illustration. A lawyer representing the laundry industry in which many of the women were being paid 50 cents an hour came to my office to discuss his application for an increase for these workers. I told him that this could not be approved. (It was the rate paid throughout the industry, not by only a few). He argued long and

EHH: hard and repeated again and again, "We simply cannot operate with a 50 cent rate."

I knew this lawyer well in connection with my membership on the Industrial Welfare Commission, which a few months earlier had increased the minimum from 35 cents to 50 cents an hour. At the hearings this representative of the laundry industry had appeared time and again arguing, "If you raise this wage the laundry industry will go broke."

Since I knew this man well I felt free to have what might be termed an informal conversation, perhaps even indulging in a bit of humor. I said, "If you had thought up this idea a year ago and had been wishing to pay the workers something above the very low minimum which the Industrial Welfare Commission had established, you wouldn't now be in the bind you describe."

King: Was the lawyer offended by your remark?

EHH: No, he didn't seem to mind at all that I had merely pointed out what he already knew. I added a few more remarks, "Now we are on opposite sides of the table," "You want to raise wages and I must say it cannot be allowed." I added one further comment, "I am sure that you know that I think the 50 cent minimum is far too low, but I must act in accordance with the principles of the law I am helping to administer."

As I recall, no case was ever submitted, and my relations with the lawyer who also represented other industries were always pleasant.

King: Can you give an illustration of "effective prosecution of the war" cases that you mentioned?

EHH: Yes. We of course had many cases involving firms producing war materials. If they could prove, and often they could, that they simply could not get an adequate number of workers at the rates which were allowable for non-war industries, somewhat higher rates could be approved.

The Wage Stabilization Division analyzed these cases and made recommendations, but the decision was made by the War Labor Board. Because this was a serious and complex problem, the application was always presented to the War Labor Board, and a hearing held at which the firm making the request could present their case.

In addition to the cases, and they were the majority, who could produce at least reasonable arguments that they were in great trouble in trying to fill orders of great importance in a war economy, there were some who attempted to use the war as a

EHH: screen through which they could increase wages with no relation to the needs of the war. Cases of this sort were not numerous, but they were certainly a time-consuming nuisance.

I will describe one such case which was so exaggerated as to seem almost a joke. However, it was an actual case, and there were others perhaps not quite as absurd, but all were trying to blind the Board as to the real purpose of their requests.

A lawyer came to my office, a man whom I knew quite well (not the same lawyer I have just mentioned). He was representing the Burlingame Country Club and had prepared a case to be presented under the effective prosecution of the war clause. After examining the application he had prepared, I found it was a request to raise the wage of the chef from \$350 to over \$500 a month.

I said, "How could you, a highly trained lawyer, bring such a case in? Do you really think a chef at this club is necessary to the war effort?"

He said, "I certainly do. Our members are practically all attempting to manage war industries. If they are to have some leisure and rest over the weekend they must have meals at the club or they won't return to their jobs rested and ready to work hard producing war materials the next week. This is necessary for the effective prosecution of the war."

I said, "You can't possibly be serious?" His answer was, "I certainly am, and here is the case."

Since the case had been submitted, it was analyzed in the Wage Stabilization Division and denied. That was the end of it, and it was never appealed. I am sure that the attorney was acting under instructions from the club. I saw him many times after this representing other employers. The "case" was never mentioned, and he was as friendly and pleasant to deal with as ever.

King: Can you tell me about some of the problems which arose during the time you were Wage Stabilization Director?

EHH: Yes. Of course there were a few difficulties. I had a fine staff of young people, all college graduates, many with some training in economics. The men were those who could not qualify for military service, usually because of some minor physical disability, or for some other reason they were not drafted.

Many of the women were wives of men in the service, and almost all had small children. With few exceptions, these young people were competent and conscientious. Some of the women came

EHH: to work even when a child was sick and alone at home. On a few occasions I was aware that a woman was worried and distracted. When I discovered the problem was a sick child, I said, "You must go home at once. It is completely wrong for me to allow you to neglect your child."

Of course allow was not quite the word, because going home, except for a few hours which might be ignored, I had no authority to see that she was paid for time off. However, in every one of these cases the mother did go home and returned to work usually in a day or two. And she was usually grateful that she had been with her sick child.

Inevitably there were a few problems in the analysis of cases which was the responsibility of the staff under my supervision. But I or my assistant examined every case before a decision was sent.

The rules and regulations of the War Labor Board were not always crystal clear. Although we made every effort to see that every analyst understood the guidelines and rules which must be followed, occasionally an analyst would allow a personal opinion or theory to creep in.

This was usually a request for an increase from a very low wage, and approval was recommended by the analyst although under the rules there was not adequate evidence that it could be approved. There were not many such cases, and the difficulty was always (I think) solved by a discussion with the analyst, and an explanation that we were enforcing a law, whether we liked its provisions or not.

As I have said, most of my staff were intelligent and conscientious. Of course some were more competent than others, and these were the ones put in charge of a section of five or six people. Thus many of the problems of analysis were solved before the case ever came to my desk.

There was only one staff member who was not only careless but sometimes came close to dishonesty. I finally told him that his work was not satisfactory and gave the reasons. I gave him the opportunity to resign and he finally did.

This young man was a Negro. Certainly the color of his skin had nothing to do with my actions, but even as long ago as 1943 I wondered whether some people on my staff might think I had some racial prejudice. They were almost all young people with concern about social and economic problems. I hoped that they knew me well enough, and also the work of the young man, to know that it was inefficiency which was the reason for my decision.

EHH: At this point I called the personnel office and requested a replacement. What a stroke of luck I had. In a day or two I was called to interview an applicant. In a few minutes in came a young Negro woman, who was at the top of the list in the personnel office.

Her qualifications were excellent; she was a graduate of Hunter College in New York with a major in economics. In addition she had a pleasant personality and was intelligent in her discussion of the work she would be required to do. She was at work within a few days, and in every way she proved to be an excellent addition to the staff.

I had very few problems in dealing with the War Labor Board. The Board made the first decision in a few cases, but the vast majority were those appealed from a Wage Stabilization decision. Many cases were not appealed, and those that were usually involved complex problems or strong employer and union relationships.

I never saw any statistics as to how many of the Wage Stabilization decisions were upheld or overturned, but there were not many. Either I or my assistant were always requested to be present when our decisions were being contested and were given an opportunity to explain our decisions.

As I have already said, the Board was made up of one third employer and one third labor representatives and one third "public" representatives, one of whom was the chairman. These were men who qualified as neutral in struggles between employers and labor.

Inevitably, not infrequently Board meetings were somewhat distressing displays of anger and rudeness, particularly between labor and industry representatives. Sometimes industry thought our decision approved a wage which was too high and labor thought it too low, but since labor was in such short supply, often both of these groups were pressing for a decision to permit a higher wage.

The public members always upheld the purpose and rules of Wage Stabilization, and they usually upheld the decision of the Wage Stabilization Division. But of course not always--sometimes because new data were presented at the hearing, and sometimes because they simply did not agree with our decision. Occasionally the public members were outvoted and the law was, to say the least, bent. This, however, did not occur frequently.

In spite of the disagreements and sometimes loudly voiced anger at the Board meetings, the honesty or integrity of the Wage Stabilization Division was almost never questioned, and then only in the heat of anger when both labor and industry were trying

EHH: to get something which they knew was contrary to the law.

I think that all of us on the Wage Stabilization Division ignored these "temper tantrums." And we felt that in general our work was respected by the Board. I felt this also in my many conferences with Board members. Both employer and labor representatives and the public members were always ready to help and advise us when a case with many complexities was being analyzed.

King: How effective were these wage controls during World War II?

EHH: This question was often asked during and after World War II, and a number of studies were published. I, of course, read all these studies at the time and will not go back now and review all the results. However, the great preponderance of evidence showed that both wage and price controls were reasonably successful.

For example, one of the studies compared World War I, without these controls, and World War II, with controls. While neither wages nor prices remained completely stable in World War II, the increases were far less than in World War I.

For a brief period during World War II, prices and wages took a spurt upward. These were the months during which, as I mentioned earlier, the rules allowed several types of wage increases, which were soon put in the denial categories. Thus the overall increases, while certainly not nil, were curtailed. I think the laws were successful in preventing runaway wage and also price increases.

King: So in your opinion wage controls in World War II, if far from perfect, at least were reasonably effective in playing a part in the prevention of runaway inflation. Do you think that now, when we are all suffering from inflation, we should reinstate wage and price control laws?

EHH: My answer would be, "Not at this moment." But I would not follow our President, who I think said, "Never."

In the last 25 years, we have learned much about a variety of controls over our economy. Monetary and fiscal measures hopefully can be used to reduce some of the pressures which push up prices and wages and may result in incomes which, though larger, will buy less and less.

If we are willing to use the powers our government already has, the more cumbersome, often less effective, and certainly greatly disliked direct controls of wages and prices may be considered. However, if what our government is trying to do,

EHH: sometimes quite feebly and too late, is not effective, it might be essential again to take direct action to control prices and wages.

King: When the war was over in 1945, what did you do?

EHH: World War II came to an end on September 2, 1945, and the War Labor Board was soon to go out of business. Some members of the staff left immediately, but several were asked to stay on for a short time to help in the preparations for closing the office. I stayed until December and returned to the University for the semester beginning in January, 1946.

Many of my friends had said to me, "You will never return to the University. You will stay in government. It is more exciting, and you get more money."

My answer was always, "Academic life is my preference. These years have been interesting, and I think a valuable experience, but the University is where I want to be." This was my final as well as earlier decision. And although my life at the University was not always happy, especially during the Oath fight, I never regretted my decision.

VIII THE REGENTS' OATH*

King: You were in Paris at the time the oath was promulgated and came to you for signature?

EHH: Yes. I was in Paris for the summer of 1949 when I received my appointment letter. It included a constitutional oath to support the Constitutions of the United States and the State of California and to faithfully discharge the duties of my office to the best of my ability. This oath the faculty were not unwilling to sign.

But we were also to be required by the Regents' action of June 24, 1949 to sign a special oath before the letter of acceptance of appointment would be honored. I would like to give you the actual words of this oath: "I am not a member of the Communist Party or under any oath or party to any agreement that is in conflict with my obligations under this oath."

King: Had you any previous knowledge that this new oath would be required?

EHH: Yes. The oath fight had begun during March and April of 1949 while I was on the campus. I, along with a large proportion--I think most--of the faculty, was distressed and angered as well by the Regents' even considering this type of oath as a test which must be passed before an appointment would be made.

Meeting after meeting was held by small and large groups of the faculty, and representatives were appointed to explain our reasons for strong opposition to this action which a considerable number but fortunately not all of the Regents seemed to think

*In order to refresh my memory as to dates I referred to two books on the oath:

George R. Stewart, The Year of the Oath, Doubleday & Co., 1950.
David P. Gardner, The California Oath Controversy, University of California Press, 1967.

--EHH

EHH: must be taken. Of course a few faculty members thought that we were making too much of putting our signature on a few words. They said, "Why make such a fuss?"

I strongly supported those who believed that important issues were at stake. The requirement of this new oath we believed was destructive of the principles of a university and devastating to a faculty who had proven their integrity and scholarly ability, and who had been given the freedom to teach without any political test.

We urged our representatives to try through President Sproul to be permitted to confer with the Regents. There was at least some optimism that perhaps the Regents could be made to understand that the action they were proposing violated the principles of what had been a free academic community. The Academic Senate had its own mechanism, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, with the responsibility of recommending the removal of any faculty member who violated the principles of integrity and objectivity in his teaching.

If any member of the faculty was operating as an agent of the Communist Party or of any political party or special interest group, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure could after appropriate investigations and hearings recommend that he be denied a faculty appointment.

Why should a faculty made up of men dedicated to true scholarship and honesty in presenting divergent views have to swear that they were not proselytizing for some specific idea? If we all had to swear all the things we would not do it would be absurd, and it seemed that even the Regents would recognize the absurdity.

However, they were concerned with Communism, a word which for many years has been fraught with terror, and some were unwilling or unable to see the broad principles which were violated by the oath they proposed.

For many months our faculty representatives gave of their time, day and night. Although faculty members were not permitted to ask Regents to confer with them, I am certain that they used every possible channel of communication, including "secret" conferences with some of the Regents who were opposed to the oath. I would guess that Jesse Steinhart was one of these.

Our chief opponent was John Francis Neylan, and I doubt that he would have been willing to allow any member of our faculty to explain the reasons for our opposition to the oath. He would have thought that an opponent of the oath was a Communist himself.

EHH: The few facts I have mentioned of course do not tell the whole struggle, the burden of which was borne by many of our finest faculty. But all was to no avail. On June 24, 1949, the vote was taken and we lost the first battle. But there were many more to come, with victory in the end, but not until the University suffered and dozens, perhaps hundreds, of individuals made severe sacrifices.

King: You have said that you were in Paris when you received the oath to be signed. At that moment you had to make your decision to sign or not to sign. What did you do when you opened the letter from the University?

EHH: My first reaction was one of surprise. I had been too optimistic, and now the choice was sign or be fired. I do not recall my thought processes as I left the hotel with the document in my hand. I was walking toward the Place Vendome to find a notary at my bank. For some reason not apparent to me now I had decided to sign.

However before I got to the door of the bank, I remember saying to myself, 'I cannot sign,' and I turned back. The memory of what had been going on on the campus was still vivid, and apparently quickly reversed my decision to sign.

King: What was happening when you returned to Berkeley in the fall of 1949?

EHH: I found the campus seething with worry and discontent, and a warning of dismissal if the oath was not signed by April 30, 1950.

King: This was the deadline that was considered to be "sign or get out"?

EHH: Yes, but the date was later extended to September 4th.

King: Have you impressions of particular people who were involved in the oath controversy either among the signers or the non-signers?

EHH: Yes, of course, although with such a large faculty, I could not always know when or why each person finally made his decision to sign or not to sign. Furthermore, I will not make any comments about individuals who signed. A few, as I have mentioned, were quick to sign since they believed that no important principles were involved.

The vast majority held off signing for varying periods of time, and finally put their names on the document for family or economic reasons. They continued to believe that the Regents' oath was a tragedy to the individual faculty member and to the University.

EHH: I, of course, cannot suggest that these people should be put on a blacklist. I myself finally signed. Furthermore, even if I had remained a non-signer to the end I would not enter into any agreement to "condemn" as traitors those who signed. Perhaps a psychologist could have classified each reason as "good" or "bad."

I am certain that this was not the opinion of our distinguished psychologist, Edward C. Tolman, who never signed and was the guide and mentor of the non-signers from the first day to the end. I have never known a man for whom I had greater admiration and warm regard. I came to know him well and never did I hear him utter a word of disrespect or bitterness toward a signer.

King: Could you go back to your return to the campus in the fall of 1949 and tell me something about what happened after that?

EHH: Yes. I will give you some of the highlights of the next years. Although the oath had been passed by the Regents in June, 1949, the faculty, including many signers as well as all the non-signers, were now trying by what might be called secret diplomacy (although not always secret) to get the Regents to rescind their action. They had a minor success in that the non-signers were allowed to remain on the faculty at the beginning of the fall semester. But a deadline was set for April 30, 1950.

In the months that followed, in spite of the depression which hung over the whole academic community, the devoted efforts of many faculty members, and the convictions of several Regents that the oath should be rescinded, this action was not taken. A new and final deadline was set for September 4, 1950--a year and three months after the faculty first received the oath to be signed.

To my knowledge figures are not available as to the number of signers and non-signers as each month went by. It is, however, certain that there were many who did not sign between June, 1949 when the appointment letters for the fall were received and the beginning of the semester in September.

In November, 1949, President Sproul reported that about three quarters of the faculty had signed. As the deadline for signing came closer, additional faculty signed. In April of 1950, with a deadline of September there were about 60 non-signers.

King: It is my understanding that at about this time the Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure held hearings for the non-signers.

EHH: Yes. In May the Regents agreed to allow this group of "dissidents," as they were called, to have hearings by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. But the Regents retained the power to review the

EHH: findings, which included the power to reverse. Permission for these hearings was clearly nothing but a smokescreen.

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure immediately notified each of the 60 non-signers of the date on which his hearing would be held. Four refused to appear, and thus the Committee stated that they could make no recommendation. The report of this Committee on June 13, 1950, stated that in no case was there any evidence which could justify dismissal from the faculty. They found not one who was a Communist or otherwise subversive.

I can only of course comment on my own experience at the hearing. I was certain that the Committee on Privilege and Tenure did not at all like what they had been asked to do, but probably they thought that this was a last ditch chance to prevent dismissals.

I didn't like it either, but I had no hesitations about appearing at the hearing. However, I wondered what questions this group of men, all of whom I knew and respected, would ask. Would they say, "Are you a Communist?" or, "Are you subversive?" Of course they did not. The questions they asked were, it seemed to me, an attempt to get a sort of vita into the record, although this was already in the files of the University.

They asked me to mention the fields in which I taught and did research, and the types of public service I had done. Of course they probably knew of my membership on the Industrial Welfare Commission, dealing with minimum wages for women, and that I had worked with many legislators and a wide variety of groups concerned with social insurance, and of my interest in costs and standards of living.

It is probable that a subversive might have similar interests and concerns. But this Committee was not in the business of trying to falsely suggest that I or anyone interviewed was a Communist or subversive because of any scholarly or public interest we may have had.

I, along with all who were interviewed, was given a "clean bill of health," but on August 25th proof came that the Committee's work and their report were of no avail.

King: What happened on August 25th?

EHH: The Regents voted to dismiss 31 faculty members who refused to sign the oath. But we were given until September 4th before our dismissal would become effective. This action was proof of our suspicion that the hearings had been mere "window dressing."

EHH: The number of non-signers had dropped from 60 to about 30 during the hearings of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. Some signed and some resigned from the University to accept appointments elsewhere. Then came the final September 4th deadline. In the ten-day period from August 25th to September 4th, a few more signed and others resigned from the University, leaving a final group of 18.

King: You have said that Professor Tolman was the guide and mentor of the non-signers. How did the non-signer group function?

EHH: From the beginning of the oath fight there had been many meetings, often including both signers and non-signers, but the non-signers soon became a strong working group with Professor Tolman our leader. For many months there was no formal organization of non-signers, but from November, 1949 a group of non-signers and sympathetic signers met each week to discuss strategy and tactics.

Throughout the spring of 1950 we became more and more convinced that the hearings by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure were a gesture without meaning by the Regents and that an order to sign or be fired would soon be given. We did not receive the order until August 25th, but in early July a formal organization of 31 non-signers established the "Group for Academic Freedom," with Professor Tolman as chairman.

The question before the "Group for Academic Freedom" was, 'Will those who are fired for refusal to sign the oath have to accept this as an action to which there is no redress and simply disappear from the academic community, or could legal action be taken?'

From early July our group met daily and often into the night in a small off-campus room, financed by friends. I had decided to take a brief vacation on Lake Ontario in July, but I had a feeling of guilt and was certainly not unwilling to return to Berkeley when, within a few days, a call came from Professor Tolman.

He said, "Can you come back immediately to work with us on a plan to take our case to the courts?" My answer was of course, "Yes." We were now a small number and the job before us was to find an attorney who would take the case. By this time many of our friends had offered financial help, often anonymous. We could not, however, afford legal fees in the amounts which were customarily charged. Furthermore, there were probably many lawyers who would be unwilling to take a case involving this controversy.

At this moment we received an offer from Professor Tolman's

EHH: son-in-law, T. J. Kent, Professor of City Planning, who had only recently signed the oath, to help us find a competent attorney willing to take the case. Professor Kent with our approval interviewed as I recall about a half dozen attorneys. Several were unwilling to be involved in this case; others were unavailable for other reasons.

He came back to us with the name of Mr. Stanley Weigel. He described Mr. Weigel as an attorney of recognized competence, who was sincerely interested in the dilemma of the faculty of the University and who, in spite of our finances, was very willing to take the case.

Professor Tolman asked me to serve with him on a committee to meet Mr. Weigel at his office in San Francisco. We had a long conference and came away feeling confident that Mr. Weigel would represent the non-signers, not only with competence but with interest and enthusiasm. He agreed to take our case.

During the following weeks the attorney requested conferences many times with Professor Tolman and with the other non-signers. I took part in these conferences, but finally signed the oath two days before the deadline.

King: I realize that your decision to sign the oath must have been difficult. What were your thoughts during this period?

EHH: As the date of the deadline came close I became more and more distressed at the thought of the disruption which would occur in my life without a job, or with a job far from the place which had given me not only professional satisfaction but happiness for many years. I simply could not face this prospect, so I signed two days before the deadline.

This was a very sad day in my life, and I could only hope that my friends and colleagues would not consider that I had been a traitor to the cause about which I had felt so deeply. Of course I could not read anyone's mind, and some may have been disappointed in my decision, but my colleagues seemed to respect and even understand my reasons. Many had been non-signers for some time and had finally signed for reasons similar to mine.

I had one very unpleasant experience but not in connection with a campus colleague. This occurred on the day I signed. In accordance with a previous agreement of all members of the "Group for Academic Freedom," I notified Professor Tolman, and made an appointment with our lawyer, Mr. Weigel, and told him of my decision and my reasons.

The interview was formal and courteous, but of course Mr.

EHH: Weigel was, to put it mildly, unhappy to lose another member of the faculty he was to represent. I could understand this, but when I came out of his office, I was in no mood to take the lonely drive home. However I arrived safely.

That evening there came a telephone call from Mr. Weigel. He said, "I called to ask you if some Regent had gotten to you." To me this was a shock and an insult. I said, "This is absolutely insulting. The answer is of course no." And I put the telephone down.

I immediately called Professor Tolman and told him of the conversation. He sounded shocked and said, "Emily, I know this could not be true. Whatever were your reasons, they were your own and honest, and it is shocking that anyone would think that you could possibly have been 'reached' by a Regent." It was of some comfort to hear these words, which of course I had expected. But the hurt was still there and remains to this day.

I have always regretted my decision to sign, particularly removing myself from a group of colleagues and friends who fought the fight to the end. I would now be a much prouder person had I stayed to the end with the faculty members who I think saved our University from the disaster proposed by the Regents.

King: When did the legal action actually begin?

EHH: On August 31st, six days after the Regents decided to enforce the oath. Mr. Weigel filed a petition with the District Court of Appeals, and the following day the court issued an order to "show cause," which forbade the Regents from implementing their policy until the court had handed down a decision.

Seven months later, April 6, 1951, a decision in favor of the non-signers was handed down. Following this there were weeks of arguments at the Regents' meetings as to whether or not the case should be appealed to the Supreme Court. On May 31st, this court on its own motion took the case under consideration.

Five months later, in October, 1951, the Supreme Court handed down its decision ordering the Regents to issue letters of appointment to the non-signers. The only oath which could be required was the oath taken by all state employees. The Regents then voted not to petition the Supreme Court for a rehearing.

King: What happened after the Court decision of October, 1951?

EHH: The question immediately arose as to the meaning of the Court

EHH: decision that the oath must be rescinded and non-signers reinstated. What was the meaning of reinstate? Did this include payment of back salaries for the period during which non-signers had been removed from the payroll?

The Regents argued that the Court ruling did not require payment of salaries denied to non-signers. Apparently they did not feel that their interpretation was on very sound ground and did not request the Court to reconsider the case.

At this point the Regents agreed to pay (to the non-signers represented in the law suits) the salaries denied to them for the period from September 4, 1950 to October, 1951, less any amount they had received from teaching elsewhere. A considerable number of the non-signers had gone elsewhere to teach during this period. Some of them never returned, but others came back after the oath fight had been won.

Not until November 11, 1952 were the non-signers notified of their reinstatement. There was a long hassle over the amount of past salary to be paid to each individual which was not finally settled until March of 1956.

King: How was it possible for even the small group whose salaries were cut off to get along? I am sure that most had families to support and few had any considerable income from investments.

EHH: You are entirely correct. Certainly all would have had to seek work elsewhere if the faculty and friends of the University had not come to the rescue. I have mentioned earlier that as soon as it became evident that the non-signers themselves were not able to bear even the necessary expenditures which were small at first, friends began to come in so to speak "out of the blue." They often gave anonymously, and we were always requested not to make known the names of donors.

Most of these early gifts came from friends outside the University who believed in the principles for which we were fighting. A few faculty members were among the early donors, but when the axe had fallen in September, 1950, the faculty came generously forward. Many made monthly contributions for the entire period when salaries were cut off.

A faculty committee on financial assistance was set up to administer this fund, and each non-signer received a sum equal to his salary. I think there may have been one or two who notified the committee that their outside income was adequate, and thus their share should be used for others. I am sure that all who were supported by their friends must have had a warmth of feeling

- EHH: for the concern of their colleagues and friends in spite of distress that the Regents could have placed them in this position by violating the basic principles so important not only to this small group but to the entire University.
- King: You have said that the oath struggle began with the Regents' action in June, 1949, that the court case against the Regents was finally decided in favor of the non-signers in October, 1951, and that the repayment of back salaries was completed in March, 1956. Can this date be said to end the oath controversy?
- EHH: It ended the right of the Regents to require this so-called non-Communist oath. But it left the faculty with deep fears of what a Board of Regents could do to the University if a majority for any reason lost faith in the integrity and judgment of the faculty. Of course there have been ups and downs in the attitudes and actions of the Board of Regents, and most of those who were on the faculty twenty years ago are gone.

Probably many of the younger people have never heard of "The Year of the Oath" and to others it is only a vague memory. However I think there is enough carry-over from one generation to the next to have kept alive a continuous concern as to the types of action the Regents might take.

I should like to add just one more comment. The Board of Regents is I believe expected to be a body of people who understand the meaning of a university and who will use their authority to guide this institution with wisdom, judgment and integrity. Furthermore, it should be expected that they will not succumb to the pressures of a climate of opinion which through fear of Communism, dissent, or even law breaking, may lead them to take actions which could tear to shreds the intellectual life of a university.

Among the 24 persons on the Board of Regents there will always be differences in point of view, and some who will and some who will not understand the proper guidelines that should control their actions. During the oath fight one group of Regents, usually about 9 or 10, the exact number varying at different dates, understood the point of view of the faculty, including Regents Warren, Steinhart, and Heller.

The remaining majority under the leadership of Regent John Francis Neylan supported the oath and had no comprehension of what the effect would be on the faculty and on the University.

- King: Could you make a few comments on the relations between the University and the Board of Regents in the last 20 years?
- EHH: Yes. I will be glad to make a few comments, but I cannot trace

EHH: every action through these years. During the last twenty years there have been many changes in the Board of Regents and, of course, shifts in feelings for or against the University and particularly the faculty.

Perhaps because of the experience in the oath fight, the faculty have been somewhat aware of the problems which will arise if a majority of the Regents appear to be unaware of the meaning of a university. Although there may be some faculty whose judgment is faulty, as a group their concern is with freedom, and I do not mean license, but freedom to pursue their teaching and scholarship with honesty and integrity and not with Regents' rules which hamper them at every step.

Thus the faculty through appointed representatives should have an opportunity to be consulted before actions affecting both teachers and students are taken. I of course do not mean "pro forma consultation" or "consultation after the fact," nor am I suggesting that the faculty have a right to veto an act of the Regents. But an intelligent and wise Board of Regents should consider seriously faculty judgment. These are people not in search of power for power's sake but for a good climate in which hopefully to educate the young.

In the last years the Regents have been troubled about the campus disorders, as have we all. Some Regents have suggested extreme measures--more police using more weapons, quick dismissal of students whose acts tend to disrupt the University and the city. There have been also the frequent accusations that the University is too lenient.

It has often been assumed that it is a simple thing to handle student discontent, although this discontent now exists throughout the country and the world. Our president, chancellor, and others on the campus have warned the Regents that just a few drastic rules established by them will not cure the problem. I am certain that the faculty is well represented by these officers.

The pleas to act with caution and good judgment have been supported by a number of the present (1970) Regents, particularly by Regents Roth, Dutton, Coblenz, President Hitch, and perhaps a few others. A danger which is recognized by the faculty is that, as in 1949 and 1950, a majority of the Regents may in frustration and anger insist on rules and regulations which will cause more rather than less trouble on the campus.

I am not for a moment suggesting that the president, chancellor, faculty or for that matter anyone, has found a plan which will immediately bring peace to this or any other campus. There

EHH: is a long, long road ahead, but what is needed is not one, two, or three drastic rules, but a searching analysis of the reasons for student dissatisfaction. It will take time and very wise men to find and deal with the answers. There are plenty of intelligent and wise men on the faculty and it is to be hoped, but I doubt, that the majority of the present Board of Regents will use the knowledge and skills available to them.

The faculty as 20 years ago are aware that the fears and pressures of those who do not at all understand the problems the University faces will lead to the adoption of rules which they believe will bring order at once. When the faculty and administration oppose such actions they may, as 20 years ago, find themselves characterized as a minority of "dissidents."



Emily Huntington 1950

Wayne Miller, Magnum Photos

IX AFTER RETIREMENT

King: I was going to ask about what you have done since retirement.

EHH: Perhaps I should start by saying a little something about my reasons for retirement and then go on from there to what I have been doing since then.

I retired from the University in 1961, two years earlier than the date of compulsory retirement. My colleagues in the Economics Department urged me strongly to stay on for the two additional years. I am telling you this simply to indicate the attitude of my department and the University towards me as a person and perhaps [chuckles] as a woman--I don't know that.

My decision was no, I would not stay on for two reasons. During the decade before I retired, mathematical economics and the use, or attempted use, of elaborate mathematical techniques in every economic field had developed rapidly, and in my opinion sometimes resulted in the neglect of other types of methodology and analysis. I, of course, had some mathematics in my background, but I found the reading of the current economic literature a real chore, and often quite outside my realms of adequate comprehension.

In addition, I felt distressed at the attempt to put almost everything into mathematical terms. This was undoubtedly, in part, because of my lack of mathematical training, which it was too late to repair. However, I think many economists, particularly those in such fields as economic history, labor economics and social economics, agreed with me about what seemed to be the over-use of mathematics.

This was sometimes a deterrent in areas in which mathematical analysis was often inappropriate or even impossible, although the "new economists" did not seem to agree with me. In recent years I think, or at least hope, that there has been some reversal of the "take-over of mathematics." I believe that in part this is related to the better mathematical training of both professors and students.

EHH: Many, in the early years of this trend, jumped into this field without adequate training in the use of mathematical techniques. Misuse or inappropriate use of mathematics often resulted. I remember a very distinguished professor from the London School of Economics who was here for a year or two while I was still on the faculty. He was a very competent mathematician and economist.

I recall one day we had a conference or colloquium, as we called it, where some of the younger members of our department were making presentations on various subjects. They were using mathematics in a variety of ways. I could follow part of it, but at times I was completely and totally lost! Afterwards I said to this professor, "What did you think of it?"

"Well," he said, "Emily, if these young men knew more mathematics, they'd do much better. They are misusing the techniques, they lack sufficient knowledge of their proper use, and also they cannot make their analyses understandable to people other than the highly trained mathematician."

Dorothy Williams

EHH: My second reason for early retirement was that I wanted to be sure that it wasn't too late to do many things which freedom from a full-time job would allow. I, of course, hoped for many delightful years with my dear friend, Dorothy Williams, with whom I lived for thirty years.

We had always had many things in common: travel, interest in political and economic affairs, our garden, and the joy of a rare companionship.

Dorothy graduated from Wellesley College and then she came out here to the University of California Law School and got her degree here in 1930. We lived in an apartment together for a few years and in 1935 built our house here on Sterling Avenue in Berkeley, overlooking the Bay.

King: How did you meet Dorothy?

EHH: We met as members of the Women's Faculty Club. She often said to me, "I was having lunch at the club one day, and I looked across the room and I said to a friend of mine, 'Who's that person over there?'" My name was mentioned, but it meant nothing to Dorothy. Her response she said was, "She looks as though she came from New England. I'd like to meet her."
[Laughter]

The day we met, I don't remember. She was a graduate student at the Law School and a member of the club. She lunched there almost daily, and perhaps by chance we sat at the same table one day. I don't remember our first meeting.

King: How did you happen to build your house together?

EHH: After I had known Dorothy about six months and we were both living alone in apartments just a few blocks apart, we found that we were congenial and that it would be pleasant to share an apartment. My apartment was large enough for two, so we joined forces there. About two years later we moved to a larger and very attractive lower flat on Rose Walk.

Shortly after that two of our friends rented a house with a garden, which needed care. We dug, planted flowers, watered, etc., and both of us developed a delight in gardening to the point that we wanted a house and garden of our own.

One gray Sunday morning we called a real estate agent and the next day purchased a lot in north Berkeley with a beautiful

EHH: view. The following day we called Henry Gutterson, who was the architect of the flat we were renting. I said to him, "Would you be interested in building an inexpensive house?" His answer was yes. It was in the middle of the Depression--1934.

Within a week we had his first plan, which had to be scaled down for our pocketbooks. But within two or three months the ground was broken, and we moved in in November, 1935.

Many of our friends advised against our project (not that we asked for advice). They often said, "You mustn't build a house together! No two women can build a house together and get along."

We both said, "Suppose we don't get along! We'll sell the house and divide the profit. We'd get out of it."

King: What did you specially enjoy about having a home of your own?

EHH: Of course we enjoyed the house itself. Mr. Gutterson was a fine architect, and even with limited money he gave us a house which completely suited our needs and had charm as well. Of course this is a prejudiced statement, but in any case this was our feeling.

In addition, our main reason for wanting a house was to have a garden. I perhaps should say ground on which a garden could be developed. Surrounding the house was a completely barren hillside, and later we added three other lots, and gradually a garden appeared.

Here as with the house we had skilled advice--from Geraldine Scott, a fine landscape architect who later became our friend and next door neighbor. She made us a plan and gave us advice on appropriate planting for an easy care garden.

For those first years we dug (with an occasional strong-armed student to help), planted, watered, and enjoyed the excitement of seeing things grow and the barren ground gradually disappearing. How we did this I can't imagine, but we were both young and strong in those days and loved every minute of our "labors."

Of course we enjoyed our companionship and having old and new friends come for simple meals on the terrace, and our quiet evenings reading before the fire. But our life was not just house and garden. We were both working at jobs we liked--Dorothy an attorney in San Francisco, and I on the University campus.

King: Will you tell me something of Dorothy's jobs and her special

King: interests?

EHH: Before coming to California and soon after she graduated from Wellesley, Dorothy worked for several years in an advertising agency in New York. She often said, "It was interesting and I enjoyed life in New York, but I soon met a lawyer--an older man, distinguished in his profession. I was frequently a guest in his home, and he liked to discuss legal problems. I began to feel drawn to law as a profession and was encouraged by my attorney friend."

"On his advice I spent one year at evening law school in New York. This confirmed my interest. I was soon admitted to the law school at the University of California, and my interest in law never flagged."

After receiving her law degree in 1930, Dorothy became a member of the staff of a large and well known law firm in San Francisco. From the moment she went to work she often said, "Mr. Orrick, the head of the firm, is a wonderful teacher. He is a hard taskmaster, but in discussing briefs prepared by young attorneys his attitude is always that of a teacher guiding a student, not just the 'big boss' at the top giving orders."

I am certain that later when Dorothy was Regional Attorney of the United States Department of Labor and had a large staff of attorneys to supervise, that her attitude was that of her first "boss."

In the 1930's Dorothy and I became great admirers of President Roosevelt, particularly his concern about social and labor problems. We often worked together on memoranda to members of Congress and others and on speeches.

During each of Roosevelt's election campaigns we both accepted invitations to speak, particularly on the proposals for Social Security. Dorothy made many more speeches than I. She had great capacity to present her ideas clearly, concisely and with conviction, but she never indulged in emotionalism. She was a strong and interested member of the Democratic Party. Thus we were congenial in our politics as in other ways.

I think she felt that she did not want to spend her life in a law office dealing primarily with corporation and other types of business law, although she had found her experience in Mr. Orrick's office both valuable and interesting.

She had made no decision when to her surprise, I think in 1933, she was asked to come to Washington as she was being

EHH: considered for appointment as Assistant United States Attorney. On her return, after appropriate notice, she accepted this new appointment. This brought her into a new kind of law and also brought her an opportunity to try cases in court. She found this interesting and stimulating, and from what others told me she showed great skill in her dealing with opposing attorneys and the judges. Her competence and dignity in presenting her case was always respected.

Some years later, in 1938, Dorothy had another call from Washington and was offered an appointment as Regional Attorney for the Department of Labor. By this time her interests were strong in the types of cases which came within the purview of the Labor Department, and she accepted the appointment.

The Fair Labor Standards Act, often called the Wages and Hours Act, had recently been passed, and cases came flooding in. The job was tough but exciting. Since this was a field of great interest to me also, she often discussed her problems with me. I was always glad to act as a sounding board, but she often said, "Now Emily, please give me some help and advice." I was never sure how much I could help, but it was always fun.

Dorothy continued in this job until 1946 when she retired. Although the job was always interesting, the work was hard and sometimes frustrating, particularly during World War II when it was almost impossible to find a staff of competent attorneys.

She took her responsibility for the work of the office very seriously, and she often came home exhausted after a long day of trying to make incompetent and sometimes careless young attorneys prepare acceptable briefs. She struggled on for many months, but when ill health forced her to remain away from work as often as two and sometimes more days a week, she could not in good conscience even try to carry on. So in 1946 she retired at the age of 46.

Fortunately with the strain and tension gone, she after some months regained her health, although it was clear that she should not again take a job involving the responsibilities of a lawyer. Furthermore, her nature was to put every bit of energy--and this was always a lot--into any job she did.

However her "retirement" never removed her from life. She continued her interest in politics, and in a wide variety of community activities. Among others, she made several studies for the League of Women Voters and assumed many responsibilities for the World Affairs Council of Northern California. She took delight in whatever she was doing and always appeared to be in the most blooming health.

EHH: I think one of the pleasures Dorothy had after her retirement was the trips we took together. She had never had the opportunity to travel, and what a joy she was as a traveling companion. I shall never forget her first glimpse of Paris. It was 7:30 in the morning when we arrived at our hotel, and I have seldom seen such delight as hers as she looked out of the window at the gardens of the Tuileries.

In all of our trips, whether it was the Parthenon, the museums of Florence, a small hill town in Italy, or a village in southern France, her enthusiasm was always overflowing.

We were planning many more trips, but our last one was in 1961 to Russia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and then Sicily. Again she came home ready to start reading more of the places we had been and getting ready for the next trip. But that was not to be. She was ill for five months. Then my wonderful companion of thirty years was gone.

Regents' Scholarships

King: You have told me some of your reasons for retiring. But what are some of the things you have done since retirement?

EHH: Since my retirement I have continued a variety of contacts with the University. For several years, each spring I traveled to the southern part of the state to interview applicants for the Regents' scholarships. Have you ever heard of the Regents' scholarships?

King: Yes, I am aware of them.

EHH: These are four-year scholarships granted to high school graduates. They provide full expenses for four years so long as the student's grades are kept up. The number of scholarships throughout the state, as I remember, is something in the neighborhood of fifty, but much larger numbers of students were interviewed. The work was divided among about half a dozen faculty members, most of whom had retired.

All of the high schools in the state were notified of the scholarships, and told of the conditions under which scholarships might be granted. We had almost no applications from students in private high schools. Clearly these schools must have students eligible for Regents' scholarships. I was quite certain that these schools did not understand that these scholarships were available without regard to income. Why this was I was never able to discover.

The applicant's grades must of course be good, but scholarship alone was not sufficient. He must have a strong interest in a University education and he must show promise, which is of course difficult to measure. But teachers and counselors were often aware of those who had abilities and interests beyond grades.

For example, did a science student on his own carry on small experiments over and above course requirements? If their interests were primarily in the social sciences, did they read widely and possibly attend small discussion groups which a teacher might be willing to guide or direct? Did they do some small piece of research about an author or a subject of particular interest? If they had a special interest in mathematics, did they show a desire to extend their knowledge of mathematical techniques to a wide variety of fields?

Another element to be considered was their reasons for any special interest they might have. For example, some said that

EHH: they wanted to prepare for teaching. Was this because teaching gives security, or could it be expected that they had an interest in the whole educational process? If a student said, "I want to be a trained physicist, engineer, or physician," was it because there was such a large demand in these fields that earnings would be high? Or was he concerned with not only what his chosen profession would do for him but what it might contribute to society?

Many of the considerations to be taken into account in granting these scholarships were of course difficult to evaluate, not only for the teachers and counselors, but also for the interviewers. However, in our hour-long interviews, I often felt that I could get a reasonably good idea as to those who merited the opportunities available to a Regents' scholar.

Without financial worry and the struggle to at least in part support themselves, these young people would be free to develop to their full potential.

King: Was the financial situation of the student's family taken into account in granting scholarships?

EHH: Yes. The parents were always requested to give a statement of their income. If the student had the required qualifications, he became a "Regents' scholar" with the stipend in accordance with his family's ability to give him some financial help. For those whose families could pay all his expenses, he became a Regents' scholar without regular stipend, although he was given a small "honorarium" of \$100.

This arrangement seemed to me to be excellent. Most scholarships are given only to students in need of the money, but in this case the student's record would show that he had qualified as a Regents' scholar, even though he did not receive the usual economic support.

King: What was the next step after the interviews were completed?

EHH: The interviewer was required to list the students in order of their qualifications, and in groups rated very superior, excellent, very good, good, not to be considered for a scholarship.

I usually interviewed 25 to 30 students and was told that probably only the top 10 would be granted scholarships. A large proportion of these young people I interviewed had most of the characteristics required for eligibility, but of course there were differences. Some were very unusual and could easily be put at the top of the list. There were usually 4 or 5 at

EHH: this level, and there were a few who in my judgment should be dropped from consideration.

But between these two limits there were often real difficulties in determining the rating. Since I knew that only about 10 would be awarded the scholarships, I often struggled for hours going over and over their applications and my notes made after the interview. I tried to be as certain as I could that I had rated those correctly who in my first rating fell a few steps above and below 10.

I know that all the interviewers had this problem, and the only test of our decisions is in the fact that almost all of the Regents' scholars did very well in the University. Of course we may have done an injustice to some of those we rated lower in the scale, and excluded some who would have developed into scholars of high distinction.

All that can be said is that then and now there is no measuring stick or computer to measure accurately the mental capacity and future intellectual distinction of a group of youngsters just out of high school. I think that I as well as the other interviewers found that working with these fine young people was a rewarding experience, although there was always the fear that our judgments might be faulty.

Special Opportunity Scholarship Program

King: I believe that you also had some part in another scholarship program.

EHH: Yes. This was the Special Opportunity Scholarship Program for young people from disadvantaged backgrounds.

My interest in this field came before I retired. In 1958 or 1959 a self-appointed committee was organized under the chairmanship of Professor Jerzy Neyman of the Statistics Department. How I happened to be invited to participate I do not recall. Possibly it was because I had worked with Professor Neyman on several research projects.

Professor Neyman invited about a dozen faculty members to join with him in a discussion of the part the University might play in providing some extra educational opportunities for high school students from disadvantaged families. We worked over many months, meeting usually every week to discuss the need for special educational opportunities for young people who

EHH: had been disadvantaged both in educational opportunities and in their social environment. We found that several other universities were making educational plans for these groups of young people.

Our committee recommended that the University sponsor a program of summer work for promising students of limited economic background who it was believed had the intelligence and would develop the motivation for a college education but whose records at the end of the first or second year of high school indicated that without some help, both educational and financial, while in high school, they could probably not qualify for college entrance.

King: I associate this program with Owen Chamberlain; is that the same group?

EHH: Professor Chamberlain was not a member of the informal committee. In 1963 the Academic Senate appointed a Committee on Special Scholarships, with Professor Owen Chamberlain as chairman. The responsibility of this committee was to administer the Special Opportunity Scholarship program.

The Regents agreed to allocate some financial support, with matching sums to be contributed by the faculty. The faculty immediately came forward, and there were sufficient funds for the program to start in 1964. In 1966 the Office of Economic Opportunity granted funds for an "Upward Bound" project, but for some who did not meet the somewhat strict requirements of this program, there still continued the funds available from the Regents and the faculty.

Each year approximately 50 students who have completed their sophomore year in high school have been admitted to this program. It includes three 8-week sessions of summer work at the University and during the school year classes on the campus each Saturday morning. Although this work is at the high school level, it is not to duplicate regular classroom work, but to fill in weak spots in knowledge and to stimulate interest in the educational process.

Tutors and counselors are available to help and encourage the students, many of whom come with a sense of discouragement. Financial assistance is granted, approximately \$80 in cash for the summer, and a \$25 credit at the campus bookstore, transportation expenses, and lunches on the campus.

Some measure of the success of the program is found in the fact that almost all complete the three years and a very large proportion are admitted to a college or university. And most of these have had a satisfactory grade point average.

King: Did you have any part in this program from 1963 on?

EHH: Most of what I have said about the period 1963 - 1969 is based on discussions with Professor Chamberlain and two other members of the committee appointed by the Academic Senate, and several reports in the files. I was not a member of this committee, nor was Professor Neyman.

Only one member of the "self-appointed" committee was included in the Academic Senate committee. By this I do not wish to imply any criticism of this committee. They were all fine men and dedicated to giving untold hours to administering this worthwhile program. My only personal disappointment was that having been present at the birth of the idea, I would have liked to follow its progress.

Perhaps some members of the committee felt that those of us who suggested a plan for disadvantaged youngsters might have fixed ideas and be nothing but a nuisance in the development of the program. In any case, although I several times suggested to members of the committee that I would be interested in seeing at first hand how the program was developing and perhaps be allowed to visit a few classes etc., I got no response.

I was particularly disappointed that Professor Neyman was not included in the final committee. It was unfortunate that advantage was not taken of his deep understanding of and interest in a program for this group of youngsters. I must mention that Professor Neyman has never commented to me on this.

In 1969 I was finally able to get some first hand information as to the operation of the program. The member of the final committee who had also been a member of the self-appointed group asked me if I would help them analyze some of the materials available in the files. Although I feared that the task might be difficult, I agreed to do what I could.

Very little data had been tabulated and analyzed as to such items as the characteristics of the students in terms of race, sex, high schools attended, etc., the number and reasons for dropouts, or problems in connection with individual students, program content, teaching methods, etc.

Although everyone in the office and on the committee was cooperative, the difficulties were great in finding and in securing information from the files. I never for a moment thought that this was due to carelessness or lack of interest in the students, but to the fact that the program was new, the staff very small and each person working always under pressure. I

EHH: tried to start work in the summer, but soon found this impossible when students were in and out of the office each day. Clearly the needs of the students were and should have been the major concern of all members of the staff.

During the fall and winter there was more quiet, and when files were mislaid or incomplete one of the tutors assigned to me part-time was of great assistance in helping me to prepare what should be characterized as a skeleton report, hopefully accurate. There was still much to be done when the report had to be made. It is now on file in the office, but whether or not it was of any value I have had no word.

I should have been able to talk with students, but there was little time for this except an occasional chat when a student happened to come into the office. Again my opportunity was limited to talks with the tutors to get some indications of the problems they met. Furthermore, the information I was able to get as to the finances of the project, I never felt was very satisfactory.

I did however get some quite clear impressions, in addition to some reasonably accurate statistics. I was in the office for several days each week and of course read the file of every student. At least I got a feel as to what was going on.

King: What are some of your impressions about what was going on in the program?

EHH: I will just mention a few of my impressions as to the success of this program to which 250 students had been admitted since it began. The committee under the chairmanship of Professor Chamberlain interviewed every student before admission. I certainly saw no evidence that their choices had been poor.

Some evidence was available that very few dropped out, and most qualified for university or junior college and did satisfactory work.

In addition I saw many students, although few in individual interviews, and I often heard their discussions with their tutors or counselors. It always seemed to me that the attitudes of both students and staff showed interest, mutual understanding and cooperation. Similarly, students discussing with each other indicated that these young people were interested and sometimes excited about the opportunities they were having.

King: Did you come across any special problems in reading the files?

EHH: Yes. I of course found a few in which somewhat serious problems arose, such as non-attendance of classes, lack of interest in some subject, failure to keep appointments or just an attitude of dislike or distrust of other students or of staff. The notes in the files indicated that these were not treated as disciplinary problems and penalties imposed but rather as difficulties which could be overcome by trying to find what were the causes and to gain the confidence of the student.

As far as I could determine there were no dismissals. It appeared that most of these students had been able to make the reasonable adjustments required if they were to take advantage of the program to which they had been admitted. I only recall one case where a student was so unhappy that he dropped out. He was a white boy and was doing good work. He said he was going to leave and at first gave no reason.

His counselor said to me, "In talking with him the reason seemed to be that he was one of a very small group of non-Negroes and he felt uncomfortable in this atmosphere."

I asked the counselor, "Do you think this boy was strongly prejudiced against Negroes?"

His answer was, "No, I don't think so. He was just uncomfortable." The counselor went on to say, "Very few white people apply, and we should have more since there are many disadvantaged white families." He continued, "I think the reason for this is that the schools who usually provide the names of those they think may be eligible immediately think of Negroes as more often disadvantaged than white youngsters."

The chairman told me that the committee has been trying to get some white youngsters from disadvantaged families. He said, "They should be as aware as are the Negroes of the existence of this program."

I feel proud of our University for having given an opportunity to 250 young people, and more by now, who without this special program might have become high school dropouts and almost certainly would not have qualified for admission to a university.

The purpose of the committee was to choose only those young people whose downward path on the road to education could be reversed by a properly designed special program. It was my impression that the committee was amazingly successful in choosing students with good intellectual capacities who, with the assistance of this program, graduated from high school and

EHH: qualified for and were interested in continuing their education.

Community Activities

King: What other activities have you been involved in since your retirement?

EHH: In the past two or three years, I have done some things I really never thought would interest me particularly.

I was called up by a former student of mine, who is one of the social workers of Travelers' Aid. She said, "Our board is looking for new members. Would you be willing to serve?"

I said, "I don't know. I might. Give me a little time to think about it."

After discussions with the head social worker in this office, with an old friend of mine and with one of the board members, I decided to accept the appointment. I thought that I would try it for a year, and see whether I found the work interesting and whether I would feel that I could make some contribution to this organization.

King: What responsibilities did you assume as a member of the board of the Travelers' Aid?

EHH: Although I had always felt that the Travelers' Aid was an important community agency, I am afraid that I did not realize the extent and breadth of the responsibilities it has assumed, particularly as the mobility of our population has increased, not only by adults but in recent years by large numbers of young people often only in their teens.

Soon after I had become a board member I was asked to be chairman of the Service Committee--a committee of about four members meeting about once a month.

The first question we were asked by the staff to study and advise the board was, "Should the Travelers' Aid take some part in a program to help the so-called Telegraph Avenue young people?"

We found that the Berkeley Health Department was about to set up a pilot project, an information and referral service for young people on Telegraph Avenue. It was not feasible at this

EHH: time to set up a clinic, but these young people had many health as well as other problems and often did not know where to go to seek help. The Health Department requested participation by the Travelers' Aid, because we had so long dealt with "people on the move." It was thought that our staff could provide advice and assistance in dealing with problems, of which there were many outside the health field.

The Service Committee recommended that on a trial basis for a month we assign social workers to this Berkeley office and see how it worked. We were aware that the young people might not be willing to accept the services we could offer, because they considered us part of the "establishment."

The Travelers' Aid assigned social workers to this project for a month. The quarters were small and crowded and interviews almost impossible to conduct. We gave some small financial assistance, usually for overnight lodging, and talked briefly to many.

However, in order to try to solve their problems it was necessary to request them to come to the office of the Travelers' Aid in Oakland. Clearly these young people were quite willing to accept money, of which we had a very limited supply, but beyond this most wanted to have little to do with us. Furthermore the attitude of those in charge of this office was that "no questions should be asked." Sometimes the young person gave us a name, probably fictitious, and seldom turned up at our office for further discussion of their problems.

This pilot project was certainly not a success, but there was clear evidence of the need for a clinic, not just a referral service, and for an agency properly set up to deal with the social and economic problems of these youngsters. At the present this seems quite hopeless in view of the fact that they don't want what they call "interference" with the way of life they have chosen. But they are a sad and distressing group.

The Service Committee was also requested to confer with public officials, such as the director of the Department of Public Welfare of Alameda County. We were often requested to give financial assistance to very recent arrivals who should have been eligible for general assistance, since there is now no residence requirement.

We found that there had been some misunderstanding or even carelessness on the part of social workers of the Department of Welfare. We were able to convince the director that something was wrong, and he soon took action to correct the errors in his office.

King: Did you decide to remain on the board of the Travelers' Aid?

EHH: My decision has been to remain on the board. I found the assignments given to me interesting although sometimes discouraging. I have been able to work well with the staff, and perhaps have been of some help to the board in preparing brief reports on a variety of problems.

Committee on the Aging

King: You were going to tell me a little about the Committee on the Aging.

EHH: For the past three years I have been a member of the Committee on the Aging.

King: Is that a City of Berkeley committee?

EHH: Yes, it is the Committee on the Aging appointed by the City Council. The first job we were requested to do was to set up a Senior Center. It is in the old Automobile Association Building on University Avenue just below Grove, within two miles from where two-thirds of the people aged sixty-five and over live. It is easy to get to and has been successful in providing a number of services to our older population.

The chairman of this committee is Mrs. Sophia Kagel. She is a wonderful person and has done a remarkable job in establishing the center for seniors, which is a very important part of the work. She and the whole committee recognized that our responsibility is not just to provide a center but to consider and hopefully take action on a wide variety of problems which are of special importance to the older population.

King: Could you give me some examples of what you mean by a wide variety of problems?

EHH: Perhaps I should first say something as to what goes on at the Center. The Center is under the management of a small paid staff--the director, one assistant to the director, the supervisor of the portable meals program, and usually one part-time person. A large part of the work is done by volunteers who conscientiously serve definite hours each week, some on the reception desk and others taking charge of the various activities.

The Center is a place where our older population may come for a rest and cup of coffee after a shopping expedition or just

EHH: because he is lonely and can chat with someone for a bit or to enjoy an inexpensive lunch served several days a week. Others may come for a planned recreational activity, a musical program, travel pictures, or a game of cards. Others come to attend lectures given by specialists in various fields--for example, Social Security, Medicare, nutrition, and many others.

Still others come for specific information. We have developed a data bank with a very competent volunteer in charge. Over the years she has found the types of information most frequently requested, and a card file is available to whoever is on duty. For example, "Where do I go to get income tax information?" Or, "Who is a competent physician in my area?" Or, "Are there classes in English for those having trouble with the language?"

These and many other questions can be found in the card file. Clearly the answer to every question is not in the file. In these cases the volunteer doesn't say, "I don't know." She immediately picks up the telephone and tries to get the answer. Or if, for example, an interview with someone in a public office is required, she makes an appointment. Of course in some cases the person with the questions will be asked to return the following day when the information will probably be available.

Another activity at the Center is the portable meals program. Five days a week a noon meal is delivered to any house-bound older person for whom a meal is not otherwise available. The meals, and they are very good, are prepared by the Student Cooperative, picked up there by volunteers and delivered to the person who has requested the service.

The cost of a meal is \$1.25, but the sick or disabled person is not required to pay the full amount. Most do pay this amount, but for those who cannot we have a fund to which voluntary contributions have been made. No meal is ever denied because of inability to pay for it. Those who say they cannot pay for the meals are not required to provide written proof, but we have never been suspicious that the few who do not pay just don't want to.

Occasionally someone pays more than the \$1.25. For example, a woman requested the meal for her father, aged ninety, so that she could be away for two weeks. When she returned she called and said, "I am sending you a check for double the amount just in appreciation of what you did for my father and for me."

For the first year or two the Committee on the Aging had to concern itself with finding a location for the Center and handling all the problems of organization and administration. Although I worked on many committees at this time, my chief job

EHH: was to serve as chairman of the portable meals committee. For many months this program was administered by a volunteer who remained when she could be put on the payroll. She now handles the program "on her own" and a very fine job she does.

Once the Center was well-established, the Committee was able to turn its attention to many general problems of the aged.

King: What were some of these problems?

EHH: They ranged all the way from elevators in the BART stations, to lower bus fares, to the need for discovering health needs, to perhaps the most serious problem of housing. We won our request for elevators and lower bus fares, and in cooperation with the Health Department thorough physical examinations were made available. Housing is a very hard nut to crack, but we are now working on this problem, and hope for some results.

One other problem should also be mentioned. We found that few Negroes or other non-whites were using the Center. We have several Negroes on the Committee and have learned that the reason for this is not that we are accused of race prejudice, but because these people are accustomed to staying close to their own neighborhood.

We are now trying to see what we can do to get money possibly to establish a few small "centers" in a number of south and west Berkeley areas. Here there could be some activities and information could be made available as to services at the Main Center.

During the last year or two I have found that the small contribution I can make to the Committee on the Aging is to serve on the executive committee and lend a hand to our over-worked chairman. For example, I have taken some responsibility for appearing at City Council hearings, discussions with individual members of the Council, and members of the staff of the City Department of Social Planning.

I still continue my chairmanship of the portable meals committee, but in the main I take no part in the activities of the Center, which of course continue to be very important. I, however, know that others can do better than I in this area of responsibility. Perhaps this is just because I am lazy, but I don't think so.

It has been interesting to be a member of the Committee on the Aging, at the birth of the new program for our older population and to take some part in its early development. The organization has recently been formalized as a Commission under an

EHH: ordinance. My term will probably soon be over, and I believe strongly that new members with new ideas are desirable, so I will have no regrets.

King: In spite of a life which sounds very busy to me you must have had some time for other things that you especially enjoy. What do you do in your "leisure hours?"

EHH: My leisure hours are spent doing the same things I have always enjoyed. Of course there are more of these hours, but never too many. Reading of course must be a habit of a lifetime--if not it will be unlikely to develop on retirement. From the time I was a small child reading was one of my greatest pleasures. Perhaps that was in part because we had a good library in our home, and my father was always able to introduce me to a new book or author by just stepping across the room.

Even while I was working and read part of each day in my study, hardly an evening went by without an hour or so of non-professional reading. It might be biography, history, novels of a century or more ago--I think I read some of George Eliot every year--or it might be a modern novel, almost never a detective story, which was strange to many of my friends but I could not develop this interest.

Since my retirement, except for more time, my reading habits have not changed much, except that when I find a book of 500 or 600 pages I don't have to worry that it will take too long to finish it. My only problem is that sometimes when I have a really free day, I find myself feeling guilty and that I should really be working at chores I may have left undone. But I don't put down the book.

Gardening continues to be a favorite occupation particularly when all is sparkling sunshine. Of course I now leave the heavy work to a boy who comes for four hours a week. But there is always plenty for me to do. The lath house which I could not use much when I was working is a special delight. The seeds don't always come up or the slips live, but what fun it is when they do. I suppose that we all have an occasional day when we feel dreary. My absolutely sure remedy is an hour or so in the garden, almost without regard to the weather.

Another long standing interest is travel--of course to see or see again the beautiful art treasures of the world, but also to have some contact with people of different countries and to get some idea of social and economic conditions, often just by taking long walks away from the center of the city.

On a recent trip my companion (fortunately only briefly) on a walk in Venice after I had commented on the children in the

EHH: streets and the people leaning out of windows, suddenly said with considerable disdain, "You, Emily, are only interested in the economic conditions of the people." How could I answer that, since an hour or two earlier I had spent several delightful hours just enjoying the beautiful architecture of the buildings along the canal. I remained quiet and I fear a bit glum.

One of my great joys in travel is also to see the countryside. I often think of the charm of rural England, France, and every other country I have visited.

Finally of course, there is the greater opportunity to enjoy one's friends. Fortunately having spent my childhood in the Bay Area I have old friends in San Francisco as well as in Berkeley, and since retirement the trip to San Francisco is no problem even though it is by bus instead of by automobile. I no longer like to drive over the bridge.

At this point I feel a slight sadness. There is never a year without the death of at least one friend. But that is to be expected at age 74, close to 75.

I am quite sure that I have not painted a dreary picture of retirement. Of course I have been lucky to have had a happy working life and after retirement to have continuing excellent health, adequate income, interests which do not flag and friends. I could hardly ask for more.

INDEX - Emily H. Huntington

- Addis, Thomas, Dr., 57
 Armstrong, Barbara Nachtrieb, 51-61
- Berkeley, City of: Committee on Aging, 105-108
 Beveridge, William, Sir, 31, 52
 Bowley, R.A., 24
 Brady, Dorothy, 45
 Brown, Agnes, 3
 Bullock, Charles Jesse, 33, 34
- Campbell, , 2
 Chamberlain, Owen, 99, 100, 101
 Christie, Vera, 66
 Coblentz, William K., 87
 Committee on the Aging, City of Berkeley, 105-108
 Cross, Ira, Prof., 7
- Dalton, Hugh, 24
 Day, Edward, 34
 DeBakey, Michael, Dr., 63
 Dobrezensky, Milton, 6
 Dulles, Eleanor, 8, 20, 22-38
 Dulles, Allen Macy, 22
 Dutton, Frederick G., 87
- Felton, Katherine, 44
 Fisher, Lloyd, 67
 Fleisher, Alex, 16, 17
 Frankel, Lee, 16, 17
- Gutterson, Henry, 92
- Hart, Walter Morris, 9
 Hatfield, Henry, 7
 Heller, Ed, 46, 86
 Heller, Eleanor, 46
 Heller, Emanuel and Clara, 41, 46
 Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics [Heller Budgets],
 40-45
 Hitch, Charles, 87
 Hobson, John A., 24
 Huntington, Harriet Pearson (Mrs. Thomas W.), 2-4
 Huntington, Thomas W., Dr., 1, 2
- Kagel, Sophia, 105
 Kennedy, Edward (Ted), Senator, 63
 Kent, T.J., Prof., 83
 Kerr, Clark, 65-67

Kidd, Alexander M., Prof., 57
 Kleinsorge, Paul L., 68, 69

Laski, Harold, 24
 London School of Economics, 21, 22ff

Meeker, Royal, 15
 McMillan, E.A., 57
 Miller, Arthur, 63, 64
 Murphy, Daniel, 57

Neblett, Thomas, 67, 68
 Neylan, John Francis, 78, 84
 Neyman, Jerzy, Prof., 98, 100

Olsen, Culbert, Governor, 57, 58
 Oppenheimer, Robert, 57
 Orrick, William, 93

Papandreou, Andreas, 48
 Parker, Carleton H., 6-10
 Pearson, Harriet, 2-4
 Peixotto, Jessica, 5-12, 14, 15, 38-41
 Penrose, Ernest F., Prof., 57
 Plehn, Carl, Prof., 5

Reuther, Walter, 62, 63
 Ripley, William Z., 34, 35
 Roth, William M., 87
 Rowell, Chester, 57

Scott, Geraldine, 92
 Shaw, George Bernard, 24
 Simmons College, Boston, 35, 39
 Sproul, Robert Gordon, 78, 80
 Steinhart, Jesse, 78, 84
 Stephens, Henry Morse, 5
 Stuyvelaar, Herman, 57

Taussig, Frank, Prof., 33, 34
 Tawney, R.H., 24
 Tolman, Edward C., Prof., 80, 82-84
 Toynbee Hall, 25, 26
 Travelers Aid Society, 103-105
 Tynan, Anne "Nan", 23, 30

Usher, Abbott Payson, 34

Warren, Earl, Governor, 58-60, 86
 Webb, Beatrice and Sydney, 8, 9, 24
 Weigel, Stanley, 83, 84

Williams, Dorothy, 91-95

Young, Allyn, 34, 35

Alice Greene King

A.B. in History and Government, Hunter College, New York City.

M.A. and pre-doctoral studies in Government, Radcliffe Graduate School for Arts and Sciences (Littauer Center for Public Administration) Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Teaching Fellow, Department of Government, Harvard University.

United Nations Intern.

Research and Public Relations, Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination, Boston, Massachusetts.

Editor, American Psychiatric Association, Washington, D.C.

Research and editing, Editorial Research Reports, Washington, D.C.

Science Program Analyst, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.

Executive Secretary, Council for Community Integration, Champaign, Illinois.

Research, writing and editing, National Housing Law Project, University of California, Berkeley.

Research, writing and editing, Regional Oral History Office, University of California, Berkeley.

